arXiv:1409.4591v2 [math.GR] 26 Jan 2015

ON THE COADJOINT ORBITS OF MAXIMAL UNIPOTENT SUBGROUPS OF REDUCTIVE GROUPS

SIMON M. GOODWIN, PETER MOSCH, AND GERHARD RÖHRLE

Abstract. Let G be a simple algebraic group defined over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 or a good prime for G. Let U be a maximal unipotent subgroup of G and $\mathfrak{u}$ its Lie algebra. We prove the separability of orbit maps and the connectedness of centralizers for the coadjoint action of U on (certain quotients of) the dual $\mathfrak{u}^*$ of $\mathfrak{u}$. This leads to a method to give a parametrization of the coadjoint orbits in terms of so-called *minimal representatives* which form a disjoint union of quasi-affine varieties. Moreover, we obtain an algorithm to explicitly calculate this parametrization which has been used for G of rank at most 8, except E_8.

When G is defined and split over the field of q elements, for q the power of a good prime for G, this algorithmic parametrization is used to calculate the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ of coadjoint orbits of $U(q)$ on $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$. Since $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ coincides with the number $k(U(q))$ of conjugacy classes in $U(q)$, these calculations can be viewed as an extension of the results obtained in [11]. In each case considered here there is a polynomial $h(t)$ with integer coefficients such that for every such q we have $k(U(q)) = h(q)$. We also explain implications of our results for a parametrization of the irreducible complex characters of $U(q)$.

1. Introduction

Let G be a simple algebraic group over an algebraically closed field k. We assume throughout that $\mathrm{char}(k)$ is either 0 or a good prime for G. Let B be a Borel subgroup of G and U be unipotent radical of B. Further let $\mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$ be the Lie algebras of G, B, and U.

We study the coadjoint action of U on the dual $\mathfrak{u}^*$ of $\mathfrak{u}$. Our aim is to generalize the theory for the adjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{u}$, developed in [10], to the coadjoint action.

Under some mild assumptions that do no harm, there is a nondegenerate, invariant, symmetric, bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$; see §2.2. Therefore, we can identify $\mathfrak{g}^*$ with $\mathfrak{g}$ as a G-module. Under this identification the annihilator of the B-submodule $\mathfrak{u}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathfrak{b}$, so we can make the identification of B-modules $\mathfrak{u}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b}$. More generally, we study quotients of the form $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$, where $\mathfrak{m}$ is a B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{b}$; we restrict to submodules $\mathfrak{m}$ that are *compatible* with a certain representation of G; see Definition 2.3 for details. We note that for G of classical type, one can show that all B-submodules $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ as above are compatible, and this is potentially also the case for G of exceptional type; see Remark 2.5 for more details.

The following are the main results of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ be a B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$, which is compatible in the sense of Definition 2.3, and let $X + \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$. Then the orbit map $U \to U \cdot X + \mathfrak{m}$ is separable.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ be a B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$, which is compatible in the sense of Definition 2.3, and let $X + \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$. Then the centralizer $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m})$ of $X + \mathfrak{m}$ in U is connected.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20G40, 20E45.

The counterparts to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are known to hold for the adjoint action of U, by previous work of the first author; see [10, Prop. 3.7, Cor. 4.3] for certain quotients of $\mathfrak{u}$ and [9] for the generalization to all quotients; in fact, we remark that the methods in this paper could be used to give alternative proofs of those results (for compatible quotients).

Theorem 1.2 allows us to define *minimal representatives* of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$, in analogy with the case for the adjoint action of U, as defined in [10]. The minimal representatives form a disjoint union of quasi-affine subvarieties of $\mathfrak{u}^*$ and parameterize the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$. As in the adjoint case (see [11]), this leads to an algorithm to calculate a parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$.

We have implemented this algorithm in GAP [8] including some calls to SINGULAR [13] and used it to calculate a parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$ for G simple of rank at most 8, with the exception of E_8. In this latter case, not unexpectedly, the computations turn out to be too complex for the program to provide such a parametrization. It would be possible to present the parametrization of the orbits in detail. However, this would be rather complicated and would take up a lot of space. In fact, we can make a good estimate of the number of families necessary to parameterize the orbits, by the the sum of the coefficients of the polynomials given in Table 1; the meaning of these polynomials is explained below. We can see that for the case G of type E_7, tens of thousands of pages would be required.

We mention that in case $k = \mathbb{C}$, Kirillov's method of coadjoint orbits provides a correspondence between the coadjoint orbits of U in $\mathfrak{u}^*$ and the unitary irreducible representations of U, [22]. Thus in this case, our algorithm yields a parametrization of the equivalence classes of irreducible unitary representations of U. There is an analogue of Kirillov's orbit method in the case where G is defined over a finite field with p sufficiently large, which is discussed below.

As mentioned above our algorithm is adapted from the algorithm we used to parameterize the adjoint U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$; see [11]. Note that this in turn is based on an algorithm due to Bürgstein and Hesselink which was used to calculate a parametrization of the B-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{u}^*$ for some small rank cases; see [5]. We note however, the algorithm devised by Bürgstein and Hesselink is not able to calculate the parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ or $\mathfrak{u}^*$ in general. Our procedure to tackle this problem is considerably more complex.

Now assume that G is defined and split over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ of q elements. We cite [6, Sec. 3], as a reference for the theory of reductive groups over finite fields, and for the terminology used here. Consider the finite Chevalley group $G(q)$ of $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points of G. In this case, we also investigate the action of the Sylow p-subgroup $U(q)$ of $G(q)$ on $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$.

In the special case when $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$, let $U = \mathrm{U}_n(q)$ be the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n(q)$ consisting of upper unitriangular matrices, where q is a power of a prime. A longstanding conjecture attributed to G. Higman (cf. [15]) states that the number of conjugacy classes of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$ for fixed n is a polynomial in q with integer coefficients. This conjecture has been verified for $n \leq 13$ by computer calculation in work of A. Vera-Lopez and J. M. Arregi, [41]. There has been considerable interest in this conjecture, for example from G. R. Robinson [31] and J. Thompson [40]. We remark here that a recent paper of Z. Halasi and P. P. Pàlfy casts some doubt on the conjecture, [14].

Of course, Higman's conjecture can be stated in terms of the irreducible complex characters of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$. There has been much interest in approaching this question from this direction, which we discuss later.

It is natural to consider the analogue of Higman's conjecture for other finite Chevalley groups. This investigation started in [12] and continued in [11]. Our new results in this direction (see Section 4) can be viewed as evidence for this analogous conjecture.

By a trivial generalization of [23, Thm. 2.1.2], it is easy to see that the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}(q))$ of $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}(q)$ and the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ of $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ coincide. Further, $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}(q)) = k(U(q))$ (see for example [10, Prop. 6.2]), so that $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q)) = k(U(q))$. The parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$ can be used to adapt the algorithm employed in [11] to calculate the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ of $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ for G simple of rank at most 8, with the exception of E_8; see Section 4. Combining our results with [12, Thm. 1.1] and [11, Thm. 1.1], we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1.3. *Let G be a split simple algebraic group defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of rank at most 8, not of type E_8, where q is a power of a good prime. Let U be a maximal unipotent subgroup of G which is also defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Then there is a polynomial $h(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ which only depends on the Dynkin type of G such that the number $k(U(q))$ of conjugacy classes in $U(q)$ is $h(q)$. Furthermore, if one considers $k(U(q))$ as a polynomial in $q-1$, then the coefficients are non-negative.*

The polynomials giving $k(U(q))$ are presented in the tables in [41], [12], [11] and in Table 1 of this paper. Also we remark that the restriction to good primes is necessary to get the same polynomial $h(t)$ as the prime varies, as observed in [4].

As mentioned above, Higman's conjecture can also be approached by parameterizing the irreducible complex characters of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$. This has generated a great deal of interest. We give a brief (incomprehensive) overview here. In [26], G. Lehrer considered the characters of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$ and in particular conjectured that the degrees of the irreducible characters are always a power of q, and that the number of characters of degree q^d, for $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is given by a polynomial in q with integer coefficients. In [19], I. M. Isaacs showed that the degree of an irreducible character of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$ is always a power of q; in fact this was proved more generally for the class of algebra groups. We denote the number of irreducible complex characters of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$ of degree q^d by $k(\mathrm{U}_n(q), q^d)$. More recently, Isaacs has refined Lehrer's conjecture to say that $k(\mathrm{U}_n(q), q^d)$ viewed as a polynomial in $q-1$ has positive integer coefficients. Further recent progress has also been, for example, in [7], A. Evseev verified that Isaacs' conjecture holds for $n \leq 13$, and, in [27], E. Marberg showed that Isaacs' conjecture holds for $d \leq 8$.

It is interesting to consider the analogues of Lehrer's and Isaacs' conjectures for other finite Chevalley groups. Our results on the coadjoint orbits make progress on this. To explain this we require the version of the Kirillov orbit method for $U(q)$, which we briefly describe.

The Kirillov orbit method leads to a bijection between the coadjoint orbits of $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ and the complex irreducible characters of $U(q)$, provided p is sufficiently large. Let h denote the Coxeter number of G and suppose that $p \geq h$. Then there is an exponential map from $\mathfrak{u}$ to U and a logarithm map from U to $\mathfrak{u}$ such that the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula holds, see [36, Thm. 3]. Therefore, [21, Prop. 2] provides a means to associate a complex character $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ of $U(q)$ to a coadjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}$ of $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$. To do this we first have to fix a nontrivial character $\theta : \mathbb{F}_q \to \mathbb{C}^\times$. Then the character $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is defined by the formula

$$\chi_{\mathcal{O}}(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathcal{O}|}} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{O}} \theta(F(\log(u))).$$

Then $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is the desired bijection. Hence, in case $p \geq h$ our algorithm gives a parametrization of the complex characters of $U(q)$. We refer the reader also to [3, Sec. 1] for a more recent and alternative proof of these results, as well as versions of the Kirillov orbit method applicable in other situation; and also to [35] for a version applicable to algebra groups.

As a consequence of the formula defining $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ above, $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}(1) = \sqrt{|\mathcal{O}|}$. By Proposition 4.1, the size of any coadjoint orbit of $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ is equal to q^{2d} for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Thus it follows that (under the assumption that $p \geq h$) the degrees of all irreducible characters of $U(q)$ are equal to q^d for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We denote the number of irreducible complex characters of $U(q)$ of degree q^d by $k(U(q), q^d)$. As explained in Section 4, our calculations verify that the number of coadjoint orbits of $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ of size q^{2d} is given by a polynomial in q, for G of rank less than or equal to 8, but not of type E_8.

Hence, the analogue of Lehrer's conjecture holds in these cases, and in fact we can observe that the analogue of Isaacs' conjecture holds in these cases as well from the table in the appendix.

It is interesting to know if the degrees of all irreducible characters of $U(q)$ are powers of q. For G of classical type it was shown by Sangroniz in [34] that the degrees of all irreducible characters of $U(q)$ are powers of q if and only if $p \neq 2$. For G of type E it is shown by Le and Magaard in [25] that the character degrees are not all powers of q for bad primes. This is also likely to be the case for G of type G_2, where it is fairly straightforward to calculate all character degrees, and also for G of type F_4. This leaves exceptional types for p good and $p < h$, where we expect the degrees of all irreducible characters of $U(q)$ to be powers of q.

As explained above, the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ of $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ is equal to $k(U(q))$. However, it appears to be an interesting question as to whether there is an explicitly defined bijection from the coadjoint orbits to the irreducible characters. It is shown by Marberg in [28] that the formula for $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ above does not always give an irreducible character of $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$. We refer the reader to the introduction of [27] for a discussion about this question for $\mathrm{U}_n(q)$. We note that there has been related recent work regarding the parametrization of the complex characters for Sylow p-subgroups of finite groups of Lie type; see for example [16], [17] and [24].

We mention that one can get various parabolic analogues of our results, and in particular of Theorem 1.3; see Remark 4.2 and [29, §5.1] for details.

To end the introduction, we mention that in Section 5 we present some new results on the modality of the action of B on $\mathfrak{u}$ which can be derived from our computations. More specifically, we are able to determine the modality of the action of B on $\mathfrak{u}$ for instances where previously only lower bounds were known. This gives a significant extension of the results presented in [20, Tables II and III], and further demonstrates the strength of our algorithm.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Basic Notation.** Let k be an algebraically closed field. Given an algebraic group H over k, we write H° for the identity component of H, and we denote the Lie algebra of H by $\mathfrak{h}$. When H acts on an algebraic variety V and $x \in V$, we write $C_H(x)$ for the centralizer of H in V, and $H \cdot x$ for the H-orbit of x. If W is a subset of V, we write $C_H(W)$ for the (pointwise) centralizer of W in H. In the case, where V is a rational H-module, then V is also an $\mathfrak{h}$-module, and for $x \in V$ we write $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{h}}(x)$ for the centralizer of x in $\mathfrak{h}$.

Throughout, G is a simple algebraic group over k, where the characteristic p of k is either 0 or a good prime for G; for convenience we also allow $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$. Let B be a Borel subgroup of G and write U for the unipotent radical of B. Let T be a maximal torus of G contained in B so that $B = TU$.

2.2. **Compatible submodules.** Let V be a faithful rational G-module. This allows us to identify G as a subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ as a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$. We often want to have the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1. *The restriction of the trace form on $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ to $\mathfrak{g}$ is nondegenerate.*

For G a classical group, we note that Assumption 2.1 holds if we take V to be the natural module; except in the case $G = \mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ and $p \mid n$, in which case we can "replace" $\mathrm{SL}_n(k)$ by $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$. For G of exceptional type, we can take $V = \mathfrak{g}$ to be the adjoint module. See [30] or [39, Ch. I, Lem. 5.3] for details. As explained at the end of the proof of [10, Thm. 3.9], we have that U is independent up to isomorphism of the isogeny class of G, so our results on the coadjoint action of U do not depend on this assumption.

For the remainder of this subsection we make Assumption 2.1. We let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the orthogonal complement in $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to the trace form. Then $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a G-submodule of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ under the adjoint action, and moreover $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ admits a G-module decomposition

$$\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}. \tag{2.2}$$

In other words, this means that $(\mathrm{GL}(V), G)$ is a *reductive pair*, as defined in [30]. We use the notation $\bar{G} = \mathrm{GL}(V)$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}(V)$.

We are interested in B-submodules $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{b}$ that are compatible with the direct sum decomposition of (2.2) as set out in the next definition.

Definition 2.3. Make Assumption 2.1, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the corresponding G-module decomposition from (2.2). Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{b}$. We say that $\mathfrak{m}$ is *compatible (with V)* provided there exist a Borel subgroup $\bar{B}$ of $\bar{G}$, a $\bar{B}$-submodule $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, and a B-submodule $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that

(i) $B = \bar{B} \cap G$;
(ii) $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} \supseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$; and
(iii) $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$ as B-modules.

We note that a consequence of (iii) is that there is an isomorphism of B-modules

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}} \cong \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Remark 2.5. It is quite an easy exercise to see that for G of classical type, all B-submodules $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ are compatible with the natural representation; a little care needs to be taken with regards to the graph automorphism in type D. Below we give a general method for constructing compatible B-submodules $\mathfrak{m}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$; it seems plausible that all $\mathfrak{m}$ can be obtained in this way, though we do not pursue this here.

First we introduce some more notation. Denote the character group of T by $X(T) = \mathrm{Hom}(T, k^\times)$. Let $\Phi \subseteq X(T)$ be the root system of G with respect to T and let Φ^+ be the set of positive roots determined by B, and $\Phi^- = -\Phi^+$. Let Π be the set of simple roots in Φ^+.

We use certain preorders on $X(T)$ to construct compatible B-submodules, as defined next.

Definition 2.6. We call a total preorder $\preceq$ on $X(T)$ a *B-preorder* if it satisfies the following three properties for all $\beta, \gamma, \beta', \gamma' \in X(T)$.

(i) If $\beta \in \Phi^+$, then $0 \preceq \beta$.
(ii) If $\beta \preceq \gamma$ and $\beta' \preceq \gamma'$, then $\beta + \beta' \preceq \gamma + \gamma'$.
(iii) If $\beta \preceq \gamma$, then $-\gamma \preceq -\beta$.

An example of a B-preorder, which is in fact a total order, can be given as follows. Fix an enumeration $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ of Π, and define a total order $\preceq$ on $X(T)$ as follows for $\beta, \gamma \in X(T)$:

- If $\operatorname{ht}\beta < \operatorname{ht}\gamma$, then $\beta \prec \gamma$.
- If $\operatorname{ht}\beta = \operatorname{ht}\gamma$ and $\beta = \sum_{i=1}^r b_i\alpha_i,\ \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^r c_i\alpha_i$ where $b_j < c_j$ for the highest j such that $b_j \neq c_j$, then $\beta \prec \gamma$.

Here we recall that $\operatorname{ht}(\sum_{i=1}^r b_i\alpha_i) := \sum_{i=1}^r b_i$.

Also, we can obtain B-preorders from a function $d : X(T) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $d(\alpha + \beta) = d(\alpha) + d(\beta)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in X(T)$, and $d(\alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi^+$. We note that such a function d is uniquely determined from its restriction to Π, and that any function $d : \Pi \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ can be obtained as such a restriction. Given such $d : X(T) \to \mathbb{R}$, we can define the B-preorder $\preceq$ by $\alpha \preceq \beta$ if and only if $d(\alpha) \leq d(\beta)$.

For the rest of this subsection we fix a B-preorder $\preceq$.

For $\beta \in \Phi$, let $\mathfrak{g}_\beta$ be the corresponding root space of $\mathfrak{g}$. Given $\gamma \in \Phi^-$, we define the subspaces $\mathfrak{m}_{\succ\gamma}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ by

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\succ\gamma} := \bigoplus_{\beta \succ \gamma} \mathfrak{g}_\beta. \tag{2.7}$$

Our choice of order $\prec$ ensures that each $\mathfrak{m}_{\succ\gamma}$ is a B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$ containing $\mathfrak{b}$.

Recall the faithful G-module V from above. We continue to make the Assumption 2.1. We let $\Psi(V) \subseteq X(T)$ be the set of T-weights in V and decompose

$$V = \bigoplus_{\nu \in \Psi(V)} V_\nu$$

as a direct sum of its T-weight spaces. We choose an (ordered) basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of V consisting of T-weight vectors, where the T-weight of v_i is ν_i, and we have $\nu_i \preceq \nu_j$, whenever $i \geq j$. Using this basis we can identify $\bar{G}$ with $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$. We then let $\bar{B}$ be the upper triangular matrices under this identification, and note that our choice of basis ensures that $B = \bar{B} \cap G$.

Next we define $\Psi(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}) \subseteq X(T)$ to be the set of weights of T on $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$. We note that we have

$$\Psi(\bar{\mathfrak{g}}) = \{\nu - \mu \mid \nu, \mu \in \Psi(V)\}.$$

Then we decompose $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}_n$ into T-weight spaces

$$\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Psi(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})} \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda.$$

Since $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a G-module direct sum decomposition, we obtain $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda = \mathfrak{g}_\lambda \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Psi(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})$.

The following lemma ensures our supply of compatible B-submodules of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\gamma \in \Phi^-$, and define $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_{\succ\gamma}$ as in (2.7). Then $\mathfrak{m}$ is compatible. More precisely, if one chooses $\bar{B}$ as above, and*

$$\bar{\mathfrak{m}} = \bar{\mathfrak{m}}_{\succ\gamma} = \bigoplus_{\lambda\succ\gamma} \bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{m}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}_{\succ\gamma} = \bigoplus_{\lambda\succ\gamma} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda$$

then properties (i) – (iii) from Definition 2.3 hold for $\bar{B}$, $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$.

Proof. It is clear that $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} \supseteq \bar{\mathfrak{b}}$, and that $\bar{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathfrak{m} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$. The main property to prove is that $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a $\bar{B}$-submodule of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$; from this it follows easily that $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a B-submodule of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Through the basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of V we have our identification of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ with $\mathfrak{gl}_n(k)$ and we write $\{e_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ for its standard basis. For $\lambda \in \Psi(\bar{\mathfrak{g}})$, we have $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}_\lambda = \langle e_{ij} \mid \lambda = \nu_i - \nu_j \rangle$. By considering how matrices are multiplied together, we see that it suffices to prove the following: Let $1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n$ and suppose that $k \leq i$ and $j \leq l$, then $\nu_i - \nu_j \preceq \nu_k - \nu_l$. Well, since $k \leq i$, we have $\nu_i \preceq \nu_k$, and since $j \leq l$, we have $\nu_l \preceq \nu_j$. Therefore, $-\nu_j \preceq -\nu_l$, and so $\nu_i - \nu_j \preceq \nu_k - \nu_l$, which is what we require, so the proof is complete. □

2.3. **Springer isomorphisms.** Denote by $\mathcal{U}$ the unipotent variety of G and by $\mathcal{N}$ the nilpotent variety of $\mathfrak{g}$. In [38], Springer showed that, if G is simply connected, then there is a G-equivariant isomorphism of varieties

$$\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{N};$$

see also [39, Thm. 3.12]. Such an isomorphism is called a *Springer isomorphism*. We note that for G not necessarily simply connected, we still obtain a G-equivariant bijective morphism of varieties $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{N}$, which is an isomorphism if the covering map from the simply connected cover of G is separable. See, for example [10, §2], for an overview of the theory of Springer isomorphisms.

We recall the construction of a Springer isomorphism due to Bardsley and Richardson [1, §9], in the case where Assumption 2.1 holds. For that recall the G-module decomposition of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ from (2.2). Let $\iota : G \to \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be the embedding of G into $\mathrm{GL}(V) \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ and $\pi : \mathfrak{gl}(V) \to \mathfrak{g}$ be the canonical projection. It follows from the proof of [1, Lem. 9.3.1] that under the assumptions made, we obtain a Springer isomorphism by restricting $\pi \circ \iota$ to the unipotent variety $\mathcal{U}$ of G, i.e. the image of $\pi \circ \iota|_{\mathcal{U}}$ is precisely $\mathcal{N}$, and this restriction is an isomorphism of varieties onto $\mathcal{N}$.

3. The coadjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{u}^*$

We continue to make Assumption 2.1, so that there is a nondegenerate, symmetric, invariant, bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}$. As explained in the introduction this allows us to identify $\mathfrak{u}^*$ with $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b}$ as U-modules. Let $\mathfrak{m} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ be a compatible B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$, and let $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$, $\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$ and $\bar{B}$ be as in Definition 2.3, and write $\bar{U}$ for the unipotent radical of $\bar{B}$. Then we have an isomorphism of B-modules from (2.4), which we use throughout this section.

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 regarding the action of U on $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$. Our strategy is to adapt and extend some arguments of Springer and Steinberg from [39, Ch. I §5].

Let $X + \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$. The U-orbit of $X + \mathfrak{m}$ in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$ is denoted by $U \cdot X + \mathfrak{m}$ and we write $\bar{U} \cdot X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ for the $\bar{U}$-orbit of $X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ in $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. We define

$$V(X, \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) := \{u \cdot X - X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} \in \bar{\mathfrak{g}}/\bar{\mathfrak{m}} \mid u \in \bar{U}\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Define the map* $f : \bar{U} \to V(X, \bar{\mathfrak{m}})$ *by*

$$f(u) = (u \cdot X) - X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Then f *is separable.*

Proof. We show that the differential

$$(df)_1 : \bar{\mathfrak{u}} \to T_0(V(X, \bar{\mathfrak{m}}))$$

of f is surjective. A direct calculation shows that $(df)_1$ maps $Y \in \bar{\mathfrak{u}}$ to $[Y, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. We have

$$\dim T_0(V(X, \bar{\mathfrak{m}})) = \dim(\bar{U} \cdot X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) = \dim \bar{U} - \dim C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}),$$

while

$$\dim \operatorname{im}(df)_1 = \dim \bar{\mathfrak{u}} - \dim \ker(df)_1 = \dim \bar{U} - \dim \mathfrak{c}_{\bar{\mathfrak{u}}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $\dim C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) = \dim \mathfrak{c}_{\bar{\mathfrak{u}}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}})$. We claim that in fact

$$C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) = 1 + \mathfrak{c}_{\bar{\mathfrak{u}}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}). \tag{3.2}$$

If $u \in C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}})$, then $uXu^{-1} + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a $\bar{B}$-submodule of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, we have that $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ is stable under right multiplication by elements of $\bar{B}$. Thus right multiplication by u and subtraction of Xu on both sides yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathfrak{m}} &= uX - Xu + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} \\ &= (u-1)X - X(u-1) + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} \\ &= [u-1, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

So $C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) \subseteq 1 + \mathfrak{c}_{\bar{\mathfrak{u}}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}})$. The reverse inclusion can be proved similarly, and so (3.2) follows. □

Lemma 3.3. $\operatorname{Lie} C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Lie} C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}) \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$, it suffices to show that the dimensions coincide. This is equivalent to showing that $\dim(U \cdot X + \mathfrak{m}) = \dim([\mathfrak{u}, X] + \mathfrak{m})$, or equivalently

$$\dim(U \cdot X + \mathfrak{m}) = \dim(\operatorname{ad}(X)(\mathfrak{u}) + \mathfrak{m}). \tag{3.4}$$

Consider the restriction of f from Lemma 3.1 to U. Through (2.4), we have that the image of $f|_U$ is contained in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$, and thus also $T_0(f(U)) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$. We prove (3.4) by verifying the following sequence of inclusions:

$$\begin{aligned} T_0(f(U)) &\subseteq T_0(f(\bar{U})) \cap T_0(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}) \\ &= (df)_1(\bar{\mathfrak{u}}) \cap \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m} \\ &= (\operatorname{ad}(X)(\bar{\mathfrak{u}}) + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) \cap \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m} \\ &= \operatorname{ad}(X)(\mathfrak{u}) + \mathfrak{m} \\ &\subseteq T_0(f(U)). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

The initial inclusion is immediate, whilst the first equality is just Lemma 3.1 and the second is the definition of $(df)_1$.

To see why the third equality holds, consider $\bar{Y} = Y + \tilde{Y} \in \bar{\mathfrak{u}}$ with $Y \in \mathfrak{u}$ and $\tilde{Y} \in \mathfrak{u} \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then

$$[X, \bar{Y}] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = [X, Y + \tilde{Y}] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = [X, Y] + [X, \tilde{Y}] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}},$$

where, thanks to the G-module decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$ from (2.2), we have that $[X, Y]$ belongs to $\mathfrak{g}$ and $[X, \tilde{Y}]$ lies in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. Thus through (2.4), we have that $[X, Y] + \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$ and $[X, \tilde{Y}] + \tilde{\mathfrak{m}} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$. In particular, if $[\bar{Y}, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}$, then $[\bar{Y}, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = [Y, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. This shows that $(\mathrm{ad}(X)(\bar{\mathfrak{u}}) + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}) \cap \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathrm{ad}(X)(\mathfrak{u}) + \mathfrak{m}$, and the reverse inclusion is clear.

The last inclusion holds because $\mathrm{ad}(X)(\mathfrak{u}) + \mathfrak{m} = (df)_1(\mathfrak{u})$.

Finally, (3.5) yields that $T_0(f(U)) = \mathrm{ad}(X)(\mathfrak{u}) + \mathfrak{m}$, and, clearly, we also have that $\dim f(U) = \dim(U \cdot X + \mathfrak{m})$, which together imply (3.4). □

We are now in a position to prove our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By a standard argument this is equivalent to Lemma 3.3. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\phi : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{N}$ be the Springer isomorphism for G obtained from the Bardsley–Richardson construction, as in Section 2.3. We prove the statement by showing that $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}) = \phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m}))$. Since $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$ is a vector space and thus is irreducible as a variety, so is $\phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m}))$. Then it follows that $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m})$ is connected.

We identify U as a subgroup of $\bar{U}$. Thus, if $u \in C_U(X + \mathfrak{m})$, then $u \in C_{\bar{U}}(X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}})$, so $uXu^{-1} + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = X + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. Since $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a $\bar{B}$-submodule of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$, it is invariant under right multiplication by elements in $\bar{U}$. It follows that $uX + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = Xu + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. Therefore, $[u, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$. The direct sum decomposition (2.2) of $\bar{\mathfrak{g}}$ and the definition of ϕ gives

$$u = \phi(u) + \tilde{Y}$$

with $\tilde{Y} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. So we have

$$[u, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}} = [\phi(u), X] + [\tilde{Y}, X] + \bar{\mathfrak{m}}$$

where $[\phi(u), X] \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $[\tilde{Y}, X] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. Thus, using (2.4), we obtain $[\phi(u), X] \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $[\tilde{Y}, X] \in \tilde{\mathfrak{m}}$. Together with the fact that ϕ restricts to an isomorphism $U \cong \mathfrak{u}$ (see for example [10, Cor. 2.2]), this implies that $\phi(u) \in \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$.

Consequently, $\phi(C_U(X + \mathfrak{m})) \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$. Since $\phi(C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}))$ is a closed subvariety of $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$, both have the same dimension, by Lemma 3.3, and $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$ is irreducible, we must have that $\phi(C_U(X + \mathfrak{m})) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m})$. Finally, as ϕ is an isomorphism, $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}) = \phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(X + \mathfrak{m}))$, as desired. □

We now explain how Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 allow us to give a parametrization of the coadjoint U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$; this is an analogue of the parametrization of the adjoint U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ described in [12]. We first fix a B-preorder $\preceq$ on $X(T)$, as defined in Definition 2.6, and assume that $\preceq$ restricts to a total order on Φ. Now we enumerate $\Phi^+ = \{\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_N\}$ so that $\beta_i \prec \beta_j$, whenever $i < j$. To ease notation, we also define $\gamma_i = -\beta_{N+1-i}$, so that $\Phi^- = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N\}$.

We define subspaces $\mathfrak{m}_i$ of $\mathfrak{g}$, for each $0 \leq i \leq N$, by setting

$$\mathfrak{m}_i := \mathfrak{m}_{\succ \gamma_i} = \left(\bigoplus_{j=i+1}^{N} \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma_j} \right) \oplus \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}. \tag{3.6}$$

Then each $\mathfrak{m}_i$ contains $\mathfrak{b}$ and is a compatible B-submodule of $\mathfrak{g}$, by Lemma 2.8. Thus the quotient $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_i$ is a B-module as well. Furthermore, we have

$$\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{m}_N \subset \ldots \subset \mathfrak{m}_i \subset \ldots \subset \mathfrak{m}_0 = \mathfrak{g}$$

and $\dim \mathfrak{m}_i/\mathfrak{m}_{i-1} = 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

Using Theorem 1.2 one can prove the following lemma. It is an analogue of [10, Lem. 5.1], and the proof follows the same line of arguments; we include it for the reader's convenience. In the statement e_β denotes a generator of the root space $\mathfrak{g}_\beta$, for $\beta \in \Phi$.

Lemma 3.7. *For $0 \leq i \leq N$, let $\mathfrak{m}_i$ be defined as in (3.6). Let $X + \mathfrak{m}_{i-1}$ be an element in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_{i-1}$. Denote $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i = \{X + \lambda e_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i \mid \lambda \in k\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_i$. Then either*

(I) *all elements of $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$ are U-conjugate, or*
(R) *no two elements of $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$ are U-conjugate.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in k$, and consider $\mathcal{Y} = C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}_{i-1}) \cdot (X + \lambda e_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i)$. By definition of $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}_{i-1})$ and $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$, we have that $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$. Since $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}_{i-1})$ is unipotent, we have that $\mathcal{Y}$ is closed in $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$; see for example [2, Prop. 4.10]. Further, $\mathcal{Y}$ is connected, because $C_U(X + \mathfrak{m}_{i-1})$ is connected. Therefore, $\mathcal{Y}$ is a closed and connected subset of $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i \cong k$. As such either $\mathcal{Y}$ is equal to $X + ke_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$, so that (I) holds, or $\mathcal{Y}$ is equal to $X + \lambda e_{\gamma_i} + \mathfrak{m}_i$ for all $\lambda \in k$, so that (R) holds. □

In case (I) of the above lemma, we say that i is an *inert point* of $X + \mathfrak{m}_i$, whereas in case (R) we call i a *ramification point* of $X + \mathfrak{m}_i$. We say that $X + \mathfrak{m}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j e_{\gamma_j} + \mathfrak{m}_i \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_i$ is the *minimal representative* of its U-orbit in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_i$ provided $a_j = 0$ whenever $j \leq i$ is an inert point of X. It follows from the counterparts to [10, Prop. 5.4 and Lem. 5.5] in our setting that each U-orbit in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{m}_i$ contains a unique minimal representative. Now we can adapt the arguments in [11, §2] to show that the minimal representatives are partitioned in to families $\mathcal{X}_c$, where c runs over the indexing set $C = \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R}_0, \mathrm{R}_n\}^N$. For $c \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R}_0, \mathrm{R}_n\}^N$, we define

$$(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b})_c = \{X + \mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b} \mid j \text{ is an inert point of } X \text{ if and only if } c_j = \mathrm{I}\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{X}_c = \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{i} a_j e_{\gamma_j} + \mathfrak{b} \in (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b})_c \;\middle|\; a_j = 0 \text{ if and only if } c_j \in \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R}_0\} \right\}. \tag{3.8}$$

Then the quasi-affine varieties $\mathcal{X}_c$ give a parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b} \cong \mathfrak{u}^*$.

The discussion above, along with Theorem 1.1, implies that the algorithm from [11, §3] to calculate this parametrization in case of the adjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{u}$ can be adapted to the coadjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{u}^*$. This is achieved by determining the quasi-affine varieties $\mathcal{X}_c$ for all c. As explained in the introduction, we have implemented this adaptation using GAP [8], and used it to calculate the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$, when G is of rank at most 8, with the exception of E_8. As noted in the introduction this parametrization becomes rather intricate as the rank grows, because the equations defining the quasi affine varieties $\mathcal{X}_c$ become more complicated.

4. Counting conjugacy classes and characters in $U(q)$

Now assume that G is defined and split over the field $\mathbb{F}_q$ where q is some power of a good prime p for G. We denote by $G(q)$ the group of $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points of G. We also assume that B and T are chosen to be defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. Then U is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $U(q)$ is a Sylow p-subgroup of $G(q)$.

We continue to use the notation from the previous section, so we have a fixed B-preorder $\preceq$ on $X(T)$ which restricts to a total order on Φ, and enumerate Φ^+ and Φ^- accordingly. Then the $\mathfrak{m}_i$ defined in (3.6) are F-stable B-submodules. Thanks to Theorem 1.2, there are

analogues of [10, Prop. 6.2 and Lem. 6.3] for the coadjoint action. From this, we deduce that the $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ are in bijection with the minimal representatives with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q$.

The algorithm explained in [11, §3] can be adapted to calculate the number $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ of coadjoint orbits of $U(q)$ on $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ from the parametrization of the coadjoint orbits. Our algorithm to find a parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$ determines the quasi-affine varieties $\mathcal{X}_c$ as defined in (3.8). Then the number of $\mathbb{F}_q$-rational points in $\mathcal{X}_c$ is calculated. We have done this in GAP and ran it for all simple groups G of rank at most 8, except E_8. We remark that the process of determining $|\mathcal{X}_c(q)|$ is rather involved and requires calls to SINGULAR. The results of our calculations are presented in Table 1 below. We note that the results of the calculation show that $|\mathcal{X}_c(q)|$ is a polynomial in q for each c. As we have already observed in the introduction, the values $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ and the number $k(U(q))$ of $U(q)$-conjugacy classes in $U(q)$ coincide.

Table 1 contains the values of $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q)) = K(U(q))$ for G of types E_7, B_8, C_8 and D_8 as polynomials in $v = q - 1$. Combining these with our previous results [12, Thm. 1.1] and [11, Thm. 1.1], we obtain Theorem 1.3. We recall also that for G of type A_r, the polynomials have been calculated up to $r = 12$ and are given in [41]; see also [7].

$G(q)$	$k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$
E_7	$v^{17} + 18v^{16} + 154v^{15} + 839v^{14} + 3298v^{13} + 10104v^{12} + 25702v^{11} + 57351v^{10}$ $+114413v^9 + 194330v^8 + 255908v^7 + 238441v^6 + 145845v^5 + 54705v^4 + 11655v^3$ $+1281v^2 + 63v + 1$
D_8	$v^{16} + 19v^{15} + 175v^{14} + 1057v^{13} + 4770v^{12} + 17192v^{11} + 50639v^{10} + 119410v^9$ $+213853v^8 + 274244v^7 + 239428v^6 + 136164v^5 + 48090v^4 + 9912v^3 + 1092v^2$ $+56v + 1$
B_8/C_8	$2v^{17} + 40v^{16} + 387v^{15} + 2422v^{14} + 11077v^{13} + 39613v^{12} + 115125v^{11} + 274653v^{10}$ $+525983v^9 + 772250v^8 + 824340v^7 + 607950v^6 + 294658v^5 + 88816v^4 + 15568v^3$ $+1456v^2 + 64v + 1$

TABLE 1. $k(U(q))$ as polynomial in $v = q - 1$

We note that the values of $k(U(q))$ are always polynomials in $v = q - 1$ with non-negative integer coefficients. This is also the case for the polynomials obtained in [11]. It follows from [11, Thm. 5.4] that the coefficient of $k(U(q))$ (as a polynomial in v) of degree 1 equals $|\Phi^+|$ and that of degree 2 is also given by combinatorial data only depending on Φ^+.

It is worth noting that the algorithm is able to compute $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^*(q))$ for groups for which the algorithm employed in [11] is not able to calculate $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}(q))$. That is, the coadjoint action seems to be more favourable for computational purposes as opposed to the adjoint action. A similar observation was already made by Bürgstein and Hesselink in [5, §1.8] in their study of the B-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{u}^*$.

As mentioned in [11, §3], there are situations where the algorithm might carry out implicit divisions by certain primes, and then the results of the calculation are not necessarily valid for these primes. Previously this did not cause any problems, as the only primes occurring were bad primes. However, for the rank 8 cases the prime 3 showed up. An alternative run of the program where division by 3 was not allowed verified that the polynomials are also valid for the prime 3.

E. A. O'Brien and W. Unger have calculated the values of $k(U(q))$ for $q = p = 3$ or 5 for B_8, C_8 and D_8, and for $q = p = 5$ for E_7. For this they used an improved implementation of an algorithm by M. C. Slattery which calculates the number of irreducible characters of each degree for a p-group, [37]. Their calculations verified our results in these cases.

For G of type E_7, we also used the modified program for the coadjoint action to calculate $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}^{(1)*}(q))$, where $\mathfrak{u}^{(1)}$ is the Lie algebra of the commutator subgroup $U^{(1)}$ of U. For that we used $\mathfrak{u}^{(1)*} \cong \mathfrak{g}/(\mathfrak{b} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_1} \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_r})$, where $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r\}$. The resulting polynomial is

$$v^{16} + 16v^{15} + 121v^{14} + 579v^{13} + 1983v^{12} + 5232v^{11} + 11268v^{10} + 21028v^9 + 36019v^8 + 55895v^7 + 68476v^6 + 56196v^5 + 27571v^4 + 7393v^3 + 980v^2 + 56v + 1.$$

This extends the results in Table 2 from [11].

The sizes of coadjoint orbits $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ can be determined in analogy with [10, Prop. 6.4], as we state and prove below. For shorter notation, in the statement we write F for an element of $\mathfrak{u}^*$, where we are not making the identification $\mathfrak{u}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{b}$, inert points of F are defined through the identification.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $F \in \mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ and let $\mathrm{in}(F)$ denote the number of inert points of F. Then $\dim U \cdot F = \mathrm{in}(F)$ and $|U(q) \cdot F| = q^{\mathrm{in}(F)}$. Moreover, $\mathrm{in}(F)$ is even.*

Proof. We can show that $\dim U \cdot F = \mathrm{in}(F)$ in the same way as the analogous result for the adjoint action is proved in [10, Lem. 5.7], and $|U(q) \cdot F| = q^{\mathrm{in}(F)}$ can be proved as in [10, Prop. 6.4]. Since the orbit map $U \to U \cdot F$ is separable, by Theorem 1.1, the tangent space of $U \cdot F$ at 0 is identified with $\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(F)$. It is well-known that there is a symplectic form ω on $\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(F)$ given by $\omega(X + \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(F), Y + \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{u}}(F)) = F([X, Y])$. Hence, $\dim U \cdot F$ is even. □

As explained in the introduction for $p \geq h$, the Kirillov orbit method gives a bijection $\mathcal{O} \mapsto \chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ between the coadjoint orbits of $U(q)$ in $\mathfrak{u}^*(q)$ and the irreducible complex characters of $U(q)$. Moreover, the degree of $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is equal to $\sqrt{|\mathcal{O}|}$ so that the degree of $\chi_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a power of q by Proposition 4.1. We define $k(U(q), q^d)$ to be the number of irreducible complex characters of $U(q)$ of degree q^d. As mentioned above $|\mathcal{X}_c(q)|$ is given by a polynomial in q for all c. Therefore, from the definition of $\mathcal{X}_c$, we deduce that $k(U(q), q^d)$ is given by a polynomial in q when G has rank less than or equal to 8 except for type E_8. We remark that it is interesting to know what the situation for $p < h$ is, as discussed in the introduction. The polynomials giving $k(U(q), q^d)$ are in the appendix of this paper; the polynomials for G of type A_r are not included as they can be found in [19] and [7], though we did verify that our program gave the same polynomial for $r \leq 10$.

As noted in [12] and [11] for the smaller rank instances, the polynomials in Theorem 1.3 coincide for types B_r and C_r. We note however that already for types B_3 and C_3 the polynomials $k(U(q), q^d)$ are not equal for all d, as can be observed from the table in the appendix.

Remark 4.2. Let P be a parabolic subgroup of G with unipotent radical U_P and Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}_P$ of U_P. Without loss, we may assume that P contains B. It is possible to define a suitable filtration of $\mathfrak{u}_P$ and $\mathfrak{u}_P^*$ so that we obtain separability and connectivity results analogous to Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for the actions of U on $\mathfrak{u}_P$ and $\mathfrak{u}_P^*$; and we also get these for the actions of U_P on $\mathfrak{u}_P$ and $\mathfrak{u}_P^*$. Then a result analogous to Lemma 3.7 allows one to define *inert* and *ramification* points for these actions. In turn this leads to the notion of *minimal representatives* for each of these actions.

This allows one to generalize our algorithm to obtain a parameterization of each of: the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_P$; the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_P^*$; the U_P-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_P$; and the U_P-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_P^*$.

Analogous to our previous results one gets that the number $k(U(q), U_P(q))$ of $U(q)$-conjugacy classes in $U_P(q)$ coincides with $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}_P(q)) = k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}_P^*(q))$, the number of $U(q)$-conjugacy classes in $\mathfrak{u}_P(q)$. Likewise for the action of $U_P(q)$, we obtain that $k(U_P(q)) = k(U_P(q), \mathfrak{u}_P(q)) = k(U_P(q), \mathfrak{u}_P^*(q))$.

To calculate the number of $U_P(q)$-classes in $U_P(q)$, first the algorithm for $k(U(q), \mathfrak{u}_P(q))$ is used to determine the minimal representatives of $U(q)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_P(q)$. Then, for each minimal representative $X \in \mathfrak{u}_P(q)$, the number $k(U_P(q), U(q) \cdot X)$ of all $U_P(q)$-orbits in the $U(q)$-orbit of X is calculated using the formula given in [29, Lem. 5.2.1].

We refer to [29, Ch. 5] for further details of these parabolic analogues and for a list of explicit results obtained using the parabolic version of the algorithm.

Similar results regarding the irreducible characters of $U_P(q)$ can also be obtained.

5. The modality of the action of B on $\mathfrak{u}$

In this section, we record another application of the calculations to parameterize the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathfrak{u}^*$. Namely to determine the modality of the action B in $\mathfrak{u}$ in the cases we have considered in Section 4. This is particularly meaningful since, at present, there appears to be no effective method to calculate a good upper bound for $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$. Our results allow us to extend the list of known values of $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$, which are given in [20, Tables II and III]. As a general reference for the modality of the action of an algebraic group on an algebraic variety, we refer the reader to [42] or [43, Sec. 5.2].

Recall that the modality of the action of the Borel subgroup B on $\mathfrak{u}$ is defined by

$$\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}) := \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (\dim \mathfrak{u}_i - i),$$

where $\mathfrak{u}_i := \{X \in \mathfrak{u} \mid \dim B \cdot X = i\}$. Likewise, the modality of the action of U on $\mathfrak{u}$ is defined analogously by replacing the adjoint B-action on $\mathfrak{u}$ by the U-action, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}) := \max_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (\dim\{X \in \mathfrak{u} \mid \dim U \cdot X = i\} - i).$$

Each U-orbit in $\mathfrak{u}$ admits a minimal representative, and as explained in [10, §2], the minimal representatives are partitioned into families $\mathcal{X}_c$, where c runs over $C = \{\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{R}_0, \mathrm{R}_\mathrm{n}\}^N$. Then $\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u})$ is just the largest dimension of a family of minimal representatives. We also note that $\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}) = \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}^*)$, [33, Thm. 1.4], so we can determine this modality by considering the coadjoint action of U on $\mathfrak{u}^*$.

In the following theorem, we show that $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ can easily be determined from $\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u})$; the parametrization by minimal representatives is required for the proof.

Theorem 5.1. *Let G be a simple algebraic group and suppose that p is either zero or a good prime for G. Let B be a Borel subgroup of G with unipotent radical U. Then*

$$\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}) - \operatorname{rank} G = \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}).$$

Proof. By [10, Prop. 7.7], we see that for any minimal representative $X \in \mathfrak{u}$ we have

$$C_B(X) = C_T(X)C_U(X) \tag{5.2}$$

and we note that the definition of the families $\mathcal{X}_c$ ensures that $\dim T \cdot X$ is independent of the choice of $X \in \mathcal{X}_c$. Each family $\mathcal{X}_c$ of U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ gives rise to a family of B-orbits of dimension

$$\dim \mathcal{X}_c - \dim T \cdot X = \dim \mathcal{X}_c - \operatorname{rank} G + \dim C_T(X), \tag{5.3}$$

where $X \in \mathcal{X}_c$.

Let $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$ be the union of all U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$ such that $\dim C_T(X) = 0$ for X the minimal representative of the orbit; we note that this is equivalent to $C_T(X)^\circ = 1$. Note that thanks to (5.2), we have that $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$ is the B-stable subvariety of $\mathfrak{u}$ consisting of all $X \in \mathfrak{u}$ such that $C_B(X)^\circ$ is unipotent. Then by (5.3), we have $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}) = \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}) - \operatorname{rank} G$.

To complete the proof, we show by induction on the rank of G that

$$\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}) = \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}) \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}) = \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}). \tag{5.5}$$

The base case where G has rank 0 is trivial, so we assume inductively that (5.4) and (5.5) are true in lower rank.

Let $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}} := \mathfrak{u} \setminus \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$ be the complement of $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$ in $\mathfrak{u}$. We show that

$$\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}),$$

which gives the inductive step.

Let $X \in \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}}$. Then there is a torus $S \subseteq T$ of positive dimension contained in $C_B(X)$. We have that $L = C_G(S)$ is a proper Levi subgroup of G, and moreover, $L \cap B$ is a Borel subgroup of L and $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}$ is the Lie algebra of the unipotent radical of $L \cap B$. Then the intersection of a B-orbit in $\mathfrak{u}$ with $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}$ is a union of $(L \cap B)$-orbits; and also the intersection of a U-orbit in $\mathfrak{u}$ with $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}$ is a union of $(L \cap U)$-orbits. Also, up to conjugacy by B, there are only finitely many possibilities for L, (each such is determined by its root system which is a subsystem of the root system of G).

Therefore, we have that

$$\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}}) \leq \max_L \operatorname{mod}(L \cap B : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}),$$

where the maximum is taken over all Levi subgroups L of G containing T. Similarly,

$$\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dec}}) \leq \max_L \operatorname{mod}(L \cap U : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}).$$

We proceed to show that

$$\operatorname{mod}(L \cap B : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}})$$

and that

$$\operatorname{mod}(L \cap U : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}),$$

when L is a Levi subgroup of G containing T. For this we may assume that the simple roots of L determined by $L \cap B$ are a subset of the simple roots of G determined by B.

By the inductive hypothesis, there is a family $\mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l})$ of minimal representatives of $(L \cap U)$-orbits in $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}$ such that:

(i) $C_T(X)^\circ = Z(L)^\circ$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l})$;
(ii) $\dim \mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l}) = \operatorname{mod}(L \cap U : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u})$; and
(iii) $\dim \mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l}) - \operatorname{rank} G + \dim Z(L) = \operatorname{mod}(L \cap B : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u})$.

Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_h$ be the simple roots of G that are not simple roots of L. We consider

$$\mathcal{Y}_c = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{h} a_i e_{\alpha_i} + X \;\middle|\; a_i \in k^\times \text{ and } X \in \mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l}) \right\}.$$

Clearly, the elements of $\mathcal{Y}_c$ lie in distinct U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{Y}_c \subseteq \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$, and $\dim \mathcal{Y}_c = \dim X_c(\mathfrak{l}) + h$, so we deduce that $\operatorname{mod}(L \cap U : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}})$.

We have that T acts on $\mathcal{Y}_c$ and the dimension of each T-orbit is $\dim T$. Therefore, $\mathcal{Y}_c$ gives a family of B-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}}$ of dimension $\dim \mathcal{X}_c(\mathfrak{l}) - \operatorname{rank} G + \dim Z(L)$. From this it follows that $\operatorname{mod}(L \cap B : \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{u}) \leq \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}_{\mathrm{dist}})$. This completes the proof. □

In the cases in which we have calculated $k(U(q))$, the modality $\operatorname{mod}(U : \mathfrak{u})$ is simply the degree of the polynomial giving $k(U(q))$. Then we can calculate $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ using Theorem 5.1. It is also possible to determine $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}^*)$ directly from our parametrization of the U-orbits in $\mathfrak{u}^*$ and use that $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}) = \operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}^*)$, by [33, Thm. 1.4].

This allows us to extend the list of values for $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ as follows. The list of previously known values for $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ for smaller rank groups is given in [20, Tables II and III]. Below for completeness we also include the values of this modality for G of type A_n, which we obtain via the polynomials calculated in [41, §5].

Type of G	A_{11}	A_{12}	B_7	B_8	C_8	D_8	E_7
$\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$	7	8	7	9	9	8	10

TABLE 2. Modality of the action of B on $\mathfrak{u}$

Note that the values given in Table 2 were previously only known to be lower bounds for $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ and were obtained by means of a rather coarse dimension estimate; see [32, Prop. 3.3, Table 4]. The construction of the lower bounds for $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u})$ is given in the following way. There exists a normal subgroup A of B contained in U with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{a}$, such that $\dim \mathfrak{a}/[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] - \dim B/A$ is quite large, and this is the lower bound given. To explain this further, we note that the adjoint action of B on $\mathfrak{u}$ restricts to an action on $\mathfrak{a}$, which in turn induces an action of B/A on $\mathfrak{a}/[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}]$. Then clearly, we have that $\operatorname{mod}(B : \mathfrak{u}) \geq \dim \mathfrak{a}/[\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}] - \dim B/A$. Our results show that in fact in the cases where the modality is known, it is actually obtained in this way.

APPENDIX A. THE POLYNOMIALS $k(U(q), q^d)$

In this appendix we include the polynomials $k(U(q), q^d)$, which give the number of irreducible characters of $U(q)$ of degree q^d. These polynomials are given as polynomials in

$v = q - 1$ and are in the table below. We note that all the coefficients are positive, which verifies that the analogue of Isaacs' conjecture holds in these cases.

We do not list the polynomials for G of type A as these are included in [19] and [7]; we have verified that our program gives the same polynomials for A_r for $r \leq 10$.

We remark that $k(U(q), q^0)$ is always equal to q^r, where r is the rank of G, but we include these polynomials for completeness.

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q), q^d)$
B_2	0	$v^2 + 2v + 1$
	1	$v^2 + 2v$
G_2	0	$v^2 + 2v + 1$
	1	$v^3 + 3v^2 + 3v$
	2	$v^2 + v$
B_3	0	$v^3 + 3v^2 + 3v + 1$
	1	$2v^3 + 5v^2 + 3v$
	2	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 2v$
	3	$v^3 + 2v^2 + v$
C_3	0	$v^3 + 3v^2 + 3v + 1$
	1	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 3v$
	2	$2v^3 + 4v^2 + 2v$
	3	$v^3 + 3v^2 + v$
B_4	0	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 4v + 1$
	1	$3v^4 + 10v^3 + 11v^2 + 4v$
	2	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 16v^4 + 23v^3 + 15v^2 + 3v$
	3	$2v^5 + 10v^4 + 18v^3 + 13v^2 + 3v$
	4	$2v^5 + 11v^4 + 19v^3 + 11v^2 + v$
	5	$v^5 + 6v^4 + 11v^3 + 6v^2 + v$
	6	$v^4 + 3v^3 + 2v^2$
C_4	0	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 4v + 1$
	1	$v^5 + 6v^4 + 13v^3 + 12v^2 + 4v$
	2	$2v^5 + 11v^4 + 20v^3 + 14v^2 + 3v$
	3	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 17v^4 + 24v^3 + 14v^2 + 3v$
	4	$2v^5 + 9v^4 + 15v^3 + 9v^2 + v$
	5	$3v^4 + 8v^3 + 6v^2 + v$
	6	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 3v^2$
D_4	0	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 4v + 1$
	1	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 10v^3 + 9v^2 + 3v$
	2	$3v^4 + 9v^3 + 9v^2 + 3v$
	3	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 10v^3 + 7v^2 + v$
	4	$v^4 + 3v^3 + 3v^2 + v$
F_4	0	$v^4 + 4v^3 + 6v^2 + 4v + 1$
	1	$v^5 + 6v^4 + 13v^3 + 12v^2 + 4v$
	2	$v^6 + 7v^5 + 20v^4 + 28v^3 + 18v^2 + 4v$
	3	$4v^5 + 20v^4 + 33v^3 + 21v^2 + 4v$
	4	$v^8 + 8v^7 + 28v^6 + 58v^5 + 79v^4 + 66v^3 + 24v^2 + 2v$
	5	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 22v^5 + 39v^4 + 37v^3 + 15v^2 + 2v$
	6	$2v^6 + 14v^5 + 36v^4 + 40v^3 + 17v^2 + 2v$
	7	$2v^6 + 13v^5 + 32v^4 + 34v^3 + 13v^2 + 2v$
	8	$4v^5 + 15v^4 + 19v^3 + 8v^2$
	9	$v^5 + 7v^4 + 11v^3 + 5v^2$
	10	$v^4 + 3v^3 + v^2$
B_5	0	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 10v^3 + 10v^2 + 5v + 1$
	1	$4v^5 + 17v^4 + 27v^3 + 19v^2 + 5v$
	2	$v^7 + 8v^6 + 29v^5 + 56v^4 + 56v^3 + 26v^2 + 4v$
	3	$2v^7 + 15v^6 + 49v^5 + 83v^4 + 72v^3 + 29v^2 + 4v$
	4	$v^8 + 9v^7 + 37v^6 + 87v^5 + 119v^4 + 87v^3 + 29v^2 + 3v$
	5	$3v^7 + 23v^6 + 70v^5 + 105v^4 + 77v^3 + 24v^2 + 2v$
	6	$9v^6 + 48v^5 + 90v^4 + 71v^3 + 21v^2 + v$
	7	$v^8 + 8v^7 + 31v^6 + 73v^5 + 96v^4 + 57v^3 + 11v^2 + v$
	8	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 23v^5 + 37v^4 + 26v^3 + 7v^2$
	9	$2v^6 + 10v^5 + 19v^4 + 14v^3 + 3v^2$

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q), q^d)$
	10	$v^5 + 3v^4 + 3v^3 + v^2$
C_5	0	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 10v^3 + 10v^2 + 5v + 1$
	1	$v^6 + 8v^5 + 23v^4 + 31v^3 + 20v^2 + 5v$
	2	$v^7 + 8v^6 + 29v^5 + 55v^4 + 54v^3 + 25v^2 + 4v$
	3	$v^7 + 12v^6 + 48v^5 + 88v^4 + 78v^3 + 31v^2 + 4v$
	4	$v^8 + 9v^7 + 38v^6 + 91v^5 + 123v^4 + 86v^3 + 27v^2 + 3v$
	5	$3v^7 + 24v^6 + 74v^5 + 110v^4 + 80v^3 + 25v^2 + 2v$
	6	$v^8 + 8v^7 + 32v^6 + 78v^5 + 105v^4 + 69v^3 + 18v^2 + v$
	7	$2v^7 + 14v^6 + 44v^5 + 68v^4 + 46v^3 + 12v^2 + v$
	8	$3v^6 + 17v^5 + 34v^4 + 26v^3 + 7v^2$
	9	$4v^5 + 14v^4 + 14v^3 + 4v^2$
	10	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 6v^3 + v^2$
D_5	0	$v^5 + 5v^4 + 10v^3 + 10v^2 + 5v + 1$
	1	$v^6 + 7v^5 + 19v^4 + 25v^3 + 16v^2 + 4v$
	2	$2v^6 + 14v^5 + 35v^4 + 40v^3 + 21v^2 + 4v$
	3	$v^7 + 8v^6 + 29v^5 + 54v^4 + 50v^3 + 21v^2 + 3v$
	4	$2v^6 + 17v^5 + 42v^4 + 42v^3 + 17v^2 + 2v$
	5	$v^7 + 8v^6 + 29v^5 + 53v^4 + 43v^3 + 14v^2 + v$
	6	$v^6 + 7v^5 + 18v^4 + 18v^3 + 7v^2 + v$
	7	$2v^5 + 8v^4 + 10v^3 + 3v^2$
	8	$v^4 + 2v^3 + v^2$
B_6	0	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 15v^4 + 20v^3 + 15v^2 + 6v + 1$
	1	$5v^6 + 26v^5 + 54v^4 + 56v^3 + 29v^2 + 6v$
	2	$v^8 + 10v^7 + 46v^6 + 113v^5 + 153v^4 + 112v^3 + 40v^2 + 5v$
	3	$v^9 + 10v^8 + 47v^7 + 135v^6 + 243v^5 + 262v^4 + 158v^3 + 47v^2 + 5v$
	4	$v^9 + 15v^8 + 84v^7 + 248v^6 + 421v^5 + 410v^4 + 216v^3 + 53v^2 + 4v$
	5	$v^{10} + 11v^9 + 61v^8 + 209v^7 + 457v^6 + 628v^5 + 516v^4 + 234v^3 + 51v^2 + 4v$
	6	$4v^9 + 43v^8 + 198v^7 + 495v^6 + 713v^5 + 585v^4 + 254v^3 + 48v^2 + 2v$
	7	$v^{11} + 11v^{10} + 56v^9 + 183v^8 + 438v^7 + 765v^6 + 896v^5 + 632v^4 + 237v^3 + 39v^2 + 2v$
	8	$2v^{10} + 20v^9 + 95v^8 + 290v^7 + 589v^6 + 751v^5 + 554v^4 + 213v^3 + 35v^2 + v$
	9	$4v^9 + 39v^8 + 178v^7 + 450v^6 + 634v^5 + 477v^4 + 171v^3 + 22v^2 + v$
	10	$v^{10} + 12v^9 + 67v^8 + 224v^7 + 468v^6 + 582v^5 + 392v^4 + 124v^3 + 14v^2$
	11	$2v^9 + 21v^8 + 100v^7 + 259v^6 + 365v^5 + 264v^4 + 86v^3 + 9v^2$
	12	$v^9 + 11v^8 + 54v^7 + 144v^6 + 205v^5 + 142v^4 + 43v^3 + 5v^2$
	13	$v^8 + 11v^7 + 45v^6 + 84v^5 + 71v^4 + 25v^3 + 2v^2$
	14	$2v^7 + 13v^6 + 30v^5 + 28v^4 + 9v^3 + v^2$
	15	$v^6 + 4v^5 + 5v^4 + 2v^3$
C_6	0	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 15v^4 + 20v^3 + 15v^2 + 6v + 1$
	1	$v^7 + 10v^6 + 36v^5 + 64v^4 + 61v^3 + 30v^2 + 6v$
	2	$v^8 + 11v^7 + 50v^6 + 118v^5 + 154v^4 + 110v^3 + 39v^2 + 5v$
	3	$4v^8 + 35v^7 + 130v^6 + 256v^5 + 281v^4 + 168v^3 + 49v^2 + 5v$
	4	$v^{10} + 10v^9 + 47v^8 + 146v^7 + 321v^6 + 472v^5 + 426v^4 + 215v^3 + 52v^2 + 4v$
	5	$3v^9 + 31v^8 + 148v^7 + 392v^6 + 599v^5 + 520v^4 + 241v^3 + 52v^2 + 4v$
	6	$5v^9 + 51v^8 + 230v^7 + 565v^6 + 790v^5 + 620v^4 + 255v^3 + 46v^2 + 2v$
	7	$v^{11} + 11v^{10} + 56v^9 + 186v^8 + 455v^7 + 803v^6 + 932v^5 + 644v^4 + 238v^3 + 40v^2 + 2v$
	8	$2v^{10} + 21v^9 + 104v^8 + 318v^7 + 628v^6 + 769v^5 + 542v^4 + 199v^3 + 31v^2 + v$
	9	$5v^9 + 49v^8 + 208v^7 + 483v^6 + 638v^5 + 460v^4 + 163v^3 + 23v^2 + v$
	10	$v^{10} + 10v^9 + 52v^8 + 178v^7 + 391v^6 + 510v^5 + 361v^4 + 122v^3 + 15v^2$
	11	$2v^9 + 19v^8 + 85v^7 + 220v^6 + 318v^5 + 235v^4 + 78v^3 + 9v^2$
	12	$3v^8 + 26v^7 + 93v^6 + 162v^5 + 133v^4 + 47v^3 + 6v^2$
	13	$4v^7 + 28v^6 + 67v^5 + 66v^4 + 26v^3 + 2v^2$
	14	$5v^6 + 22v^5 + 29v^4 + 13v^3 + v^2$
	15	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 10v^4 + 4v^3$
D_6	0	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 15v^4 + 20v^3 + 15v^2 + 6v + 1$
	1	$v^7 + 9v^6 + 31v^5 + 54v^4 + 51v^3 + 25v^2 + 5v$
	2	$v^8 + 9v^7 + 38v^6 + 89v^5 + 119v^4 + 89v^3 + 34v^2 + 5v$
	3	$v^8 + 15v^7 + 72v^6 + 165v^5 + 201v^4 + 130v^3 + 40v^2 + 4v$
	4	$3v^8 + 31v^7 + 124v^6 + 246v^5 + 260v^4 + 145v^3 + 39v^2 + 4v$
	5	$v^{10} + 10v^9 + 46v^8 + 135v^7 + 280v^6 + 393v^5 + 339v^4 + 163v^3 + 36v^2 + 2v$
	6	$2v^9 + 18v^8 + 77v^7 + 200v^6 + 317v^5 + 288v^4 + 138v^3 + 30v^2 + 2v$
	7	$5v^8 + 43v^7 + 154v^6 + 282v^5 + 270v^4 + 128v^3 + 25v^2 + v$
	8	$3v^8 + 31v^7 + 122v^6 + 227v^5 + 208v^4 + 89v^3 + 15v^2 + v$

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q), q^d)$
	9	$v^9 + 9v^8 + 41v^7 + 113v^6 + 181v^5 + 152v^4 + 61v^3 + 8v^2$
	10	$v^8 + 8v^7 + 31v^6 + 62v^5 + 61v^4 + 27v^3 + 5v^2$
	11	$2v^7 + 12v^6 + 29v^5 + 32v^4 + 15v^3 + 2v^2$
	12	$v^6 + 4v^5 + 6v^4 + 4v^3 + v^2$
E_6	0	$v^6 + 6v^5 + 15v^4 + 20v^3 + 15v^2 + 6v + 1$
	1	$v^7 + 9v^6 + 31v^5 + 54v^4 + 51v^3 + 25v^2 + 5v$
	2	$5v^7 + 34v^6 + 93v^5 + 130v^4 + 97v^3 + 36v^2 + 5v$
	3	$v^9 + 9v^8 + 42v^7 + 123v^6 + 223v^5 + 240v^4 + 145v^3 + 44v^2 + 5v$
	4	$5v^8 + 42v^7 + 155v^6 + 300v^5 + 316v^4 + 176v^3 + 46v^2 + 4v$
	5	$2v^9 + 23v^8 + 118v^7 + 327v^6 + 518v^5 + 462v^4 + 219v^3 + 48v^2 + 3v$
	6	$14v^8 + 113v^7 + 367v^6 + 602v^5 + 523v^4 + 231v^3 + 45v^2 + 3v$
	7	$v^{11} + 11v^{10} + 57v^9 + 186v^8 + 433v^7 + 730v^6 + 826v^5 + 560v^4 + 204v^3 + 36v^2 + 2v$
	8	$v^{10} + 10v^9 + 51v^8 + 173v^7 + 396v^6 + 558v^5 + 444v^4 + 183v^3 + 31v^2 + v$
	9	$3v^9 + 30v^8 + 144v^7 + 385v^6 + 575v^5 + 455v^4 + 177v^3 + 28v^2 + v$
	10	$12v^8 + 95v^7 + 304v^6 + 480v^5 + 375v^4 + 131v^3 + 16v^2 + v$
	11	$2v^9 + 21v^8 + 97v^7 + 243v^6 + 334v^5 + 233v^4 + 71v^3 + 10v^2$
	12	$2v^8 + 20v^7 + 76v^6 + 139v^5 + 124v^4 + 49v^3 + 6v^2$
	13	$3v^7 + 24v^6 + 63v^5 + 68v^4 + 28v^3 + 3v^2$
	14	$4v^6 + 19v^5 + 27v^4 + 12v^3 + v^2$
	15	$3v^5 + 8v^4 + 5v^3$
	16	$v^4 + v^3$
B_7	0	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 21v^5 + 35v^4 + 35v^3 + 21v^2 + 7v + 1$
	1	$6v^7 + 37v^6 + 95v^5 + 130v^4 + 100v^3 + 41v^2 + 7v$
	2	$v^9 + 12v^8 + 67v^7 + 201v^6 + 345v^5 + 346v^4 + 197v^3 + 57v^2 + 6v$
	3	$v^{10} + 13v^9 + 76v^8 + 262v^7 + 564v^6 + 757v^5 + 618v^4 + 290v^3 + 69v^2 + 6v$
	4	$4v^{10} + 44v^9 + 222v^8 + 660v^7 + 1228v^6 + 1431v^5 + 1013v^4 + 406v^3 + 79v^2 + 5v$
	5	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 69v^{10} + 264v^9 + 747v^8 + 1565v^7 + 2316v^6 + 2280v^5 + 1400v^4 + 492v^3 + 85v^2 + 5v$
	6	$3v^{11} + 39v^{10} + 244v^9 + 910v^8 + 2147v^7 + 3246v^6 + 3095v^5 + 1783v^4 + 570v^3 + 85v^2 + 4v$
	7	$v^{12} + 17v^{11} + 131v^{10} + 610v^9 + 1859v^8 + 3762v^7 + 4995v^6 + 4218v^5 + 2145v^4 + 598v^3 + 77v^2 + 3v$
	8	$v^{13} + 15v^{12} + 103v^{11} + 445v^{10} + 1382v^9 + 3205v^8 + 5420v^7 + 6366v^6 + 4909v^5 + 2326v^4 + 615v^3 + 74v^2 + 2v$
	9	$3v^{12} + 41v^{11} + 266v^{10} + 1081v^9 + 2961v^8 + 5474v^7 + 6667v^6 + 5145v^5 + 2363v^4 + 578v^3 + 61v^2 + 2v$
	10	$v^{14} + 14v^{13} + 92v^{12} + 383v^{11} + 1154v^{10} + 2717v^9 + 5129v^8 + 7494v^7 + 7871v^6 + 5474v^5 + 2311v^4 + 529v^3 + 54v^2 + v$
	11	$2v^{13} + 27v^{12} + 172v^{11} + 692v^{10} + 1983v^9 + 4235v^8 + 6635v^7 + 7220v^6 + 5088v^5 + 2131v^4 + 460v^3 + 37v^2 + v$
	12	$5v^{12} + 62v^{11} + 361v^{10} + 1310v^9 + 3245v^8 + 5530v^7 + 6254v^6 + 4422v^5 + 1793v^4 + 360v^3 + 27v^2$
	13	$9v^{11} + 111v^{10} + 618v^9 + 2007v^8 + 4033v^7 + 4997v^6 + 3678v^5 + 1491v^4 + 286v^3 + 18v^2$
	14	$5v^{11} + 74v^{10} + 464v^9 + 1618v^8 + 3362v^7 + 4166v^6 + 2965v^5 + 1118v^4 + 193v^3 + 13v^2$
	15	$v^{13} + 13v^{12} + 78v^{11} + 299v^{10} + 847v^9 + 1862v^8 + 3039v^7 + 3343v^6 + 2238v^5 + 821v^4 + 142v^3 + 7v^2$
	16	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 69v^{10} + 264v^9 + 736v^8 + 1439v^7 + 1800v^6 + 1307v^5 + 492v^4 + 79v^3 + 4v^2$
	17	$2v^{11} + 22v^{10} + 112v^9 + 355v^8 + 745v^7 + 983v^6 + 742v^5 + 289v^4 + 50v^3 + 2v^2$
	18	$3v^{10} + 28v^9 + 122v^8 + 311v^7 + 469v^6 + 389v^5 + 158v^4 + 24v^3 + v^2$
	19	$3v^9 + 24v^8 + 84v^7 + 153v^6 + 144v^5 + 64v^4 + 11v^3$
	20	$3v^8 + 18v^7 + 43v^6 + 48v^5 + 24v^4 + 4v^3$
	21	$v^7 + 4v^6 + 6v^5 + 4v^4 + v^3$
C_7	0	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 21v^5 + 35v^4 + 35v^3 + 21v^2 + 7v + 1$
	1	$v^8 + 12v^7 + 52v^6 + 115v^5 + 145v^4 + 106v^3 + 42v^2 + 7v$
	2	$v^9 + 14v^8 + 77v^7 + 220v^6 + 361v^5 + 350v^4 + 195v^3 + 56v^2 + 6v$
	3	$v^{10} + 13v^9 + 79v^8 + 280v^7 + 606v^6 + 807v^5 + 651v^4 + 302v^3 + 71v^2 + 6v$
	4	$v^{11} + 11v^{10} + 67v^9 + 275v^8 + 756v^7 + 1351v^6 + 1526v^5 + 1049v^4 + 409v^3 + 78v^2 + 5v$
	5	$2v^{11} + 27v^{10} + 167v^9 + 623v^8 + 1501v^7 + 2350v^6 + 2345v^5 + 1435v^4 + 502v^3 + 87v^2 + 5v$
	6	$v^{12} + 14v^{11} + 95v^{10} + 412v^9 + 1243v^8 + 2605v^7 + 3672v^6 + 3341v^5 + 1858v^4 + 576v^3 + 83v^2 + 4v$
	7	$v^{13} + 13v^{12} + 82v^{11} + 337v^{10} + 1021v^9 + 2389v^8 + 4209v^7 + 5237v^6 + 4295v^5 + 2159v^4 + 603v^3 + 79v^2 + 3v$
	8	$3v^{12} + 36v^{11} + 220v^{10} + 895v^9 + 2539v^8 + 4908v^7 + 6231v^6 + 4985v^5 + 2374v^4 + 611v^3 + 70v^2 + 2v$
	9	$v^{13} + 15v^{12} + 109v^{11} + 502v^{10} + 1632v^9 + 3859v^8 + 6488v^7 + 7401v^6 + 5425v^5 + 2393v^4 + 576v^3 + 63v^2 + 2v$
	10	$4v^{12} + 55v^{11} + 358v^{10} + 1429v^9 + 3764v^8 + 6605v^7 + 7570v^6 + 5446v^5 + 2306v^4 + 515v^3 + 49v^2 + v$
	11	$v^{14} + 14v^{13} + 91v^{12} + 372v^{11} + 1104v^{10} + 2602v^9 + 4983v^8 + 7346v^7 + 7643v^6 + 5157v^5 + 2067v^4 + 435v^3 + 38v^2 + v$
	12	$2v^{13} + 26v^{12} + 157v^{11} + 606v^{10} + 1717v^9 + 3715v^8 + 5899v^7 + 6388v^6 + 4375v^5 + 1744v^4 + 357v^3 + 28v^2$
	13	$4v^{12} + 49v^{11} + 282v^{10} + 1021v^9 + 2551v^8 + 4395v^7 + 4985v^6 + 3491v^5 + 1388v^4 + 272v^3 + 19v^2$
	14	$8v^{11} + 93v^{10} + 491v^9 + 1533v^8 + 3015v^7 + 3695v^6 + 2692v^5 + 1075v^4 + 201v^3 + 13v^2$
	15	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 77v^{10} + 338v^9 + 1030v^8 + 2084v^7 + 2639v^6 + 1954v^5 + 771v^4 + 137v^3 + 8v^2$
	16	$2v^{11} + 24v^{10} + 140v^9 + 506v^8 + 1155v^7 + 1586v^6 + 1223v^5 + 485v^4 + 85v^3 + 4v^2$
	17	$3v^{10} + 35v^9 + 177v^8 + 498v^7 + 792v^6 + 675v^5 + 287v^4 + 52v^3 + 2v^2$
	18	$4v^9 + 42v^8 + 172v^7 + 346v^6 + 346v^5 + 161v^4 + 30v^3 + v^2$

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q), q^d)$
	19	$5v^8 + 42v^7 + 120v^6 + 148v^5 + 78v^4 + 14v^3$
	20	$6v^7 + 32v^6 + 54v^5 + 34v^4 + 6v^3$
	21	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 15v^5 + 10v^4 + v^3$
D_7	0	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 21v^5 + 35v^4 + 35v^3 + 21v^2 + 7v + 1$
	1	$v^8 + 11v^7 + 46v^6 + 100v^5 + 125v^4 + 91v^3 + 36v^2 + 6v$
	2	$v^9 + 12v^8 + 62v^7 + 174v^6 + 287v^5 + 284v^4 + 164v^3 + 50v^2 + 6v$
	3	$4v^9 + 41v^8 + 180v^7 + 432v^6 + 611v^5 + 515v^4 + 248v^3 + 60v^2 + 5v$
	4	$2v^{10} + 22v^9 + 123v^8 + 409v^7 + 828v^6 + 1023v^5 + 758v^4 + 319v^3 + 67v^2 + 5v$
	5	$v^{11} + 11v^{10} + 66v^9 + 281v^8 + 801v^7 + 1439v^6 + 1585v^5 + 1039v^4 + 380v^3 + 67v^2 + 4v$
	6	$v^{12} + 13v^{11} + 78v^{10} + 296v^9 + 808v^8 + 1621v^7 + 2280v^6 + 2110v^5 + 1208v^4 + 394v^3 + 62v^2 + 3v$
	7	$3v^{11} + 36v^{10} + 203v^9 + 715v^8 + 1660v^7 + 2501v^6 + 2366v^5 + 1339v^4 + 415v^3 + 58v^2 + 2v$
	8	$v^{12} + 13v^{11} + 85v^{10} + 358v^9 + 1050v^8 + 2146v^7 + 2933v^6 + 2541v^5 + 1313v^4 + 370v^3 + 48v^2 + 2v$
	9	$v^{12} + 14v^{11} + 91v^{10} + 373v^9 + 1066v^8 + 2140v^7 + 2890v^6 + 2476v^5 + 1261v^4 + 345v^3 + 41v^2 + v$
	10	$2v^{11} + 28v^{10} + 181v^9 + 694v^8 + 1653v^7 + 2430v^6 + 2136v^5 + 1063v^4 + 269v^3 + 27v^2 + v$
	11	$4v^{10} + 65v^9 + 391v^8 + 1177v^7 + 1940v^6 + 1779v^5 + 876v^4 + 208v^3 + 18v^2$
	12	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 68v^{10} + 251v^9 + 686v^8 + 1367v^7 + 1805v^6 + 1428v^5 + 620v^4 + 136v^3 + 12v^2$
	13	$v^{11} + 12v^{10} + 69v^9 + 257v^8 + 639v^7 + 990v^6 + 891v^5 + 438v^4 + 100v^3 + 7v^2$
	14	$2v^{10} + 21v^9 + 101v^8 + 290v^7 + 496v^6 + 469v^5 + 226v^4 + 49v^3 + 4v^2$
	15	$3v^9 + 27v^8 + 107v^7 + 226v^6 + 249v^5 + 132v^4 + 30v^3 + 2v^2$
	16	$3v^8 + 22v^7 + 64v^6 + 86v^5 + 51v^4 + 12v^3 + v^2$
	17	$3v^7 + 15v^6 + 27v^5 + 19v^4 + 4v^3$
	18	$v^6 + 3v^5 + 3v^4 + v^3$
E_7	0	$v^7 + 7v^6 + 21v^5 + 35v^4 + 35v^3 + 21v^2 + 7v + 1$
	1	$v^8 + 11v^7 + 46v^6 + 100v^5 + 125v^4 + 91v^3 + 36v^2 + 6v$
	2	$v^9 + 13v^8 + 69v^7 + 194v^6 + 317v^5 + 309v^4 + 175v^3 + 52v^2 + 6v$
	3	$v^{10} + 12v^9 + 73v^8 + 260v^7 + 562v^6 + 747v^5 + 604v^4 + 283v^3 + 68v^2 + 6v$
	4	$3v^{10} + 35v^9 + 191v^8 + 601v^7 + 1149v^6 + 1350v^5 + 959v^4 + 390v^3 + 80v^2 + 6v$
	5	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 69v^{10} + 267v^9 + 777v^8 + 1669v^7 + 2491v^6 + 2442v^5 + 1489v^4 + 522v^3 + 90v^2 + 5v$
	6	$3v^{11} + 45v^{10} + 301v^9 + 1145v^8 + 2676v^7 + 3936v^6 + 3623v^5 + 2018v^4 + 631v^3 + 95v^2 + 5v$
	7	$v^{14}+14v^{13}+91v^{12}+368v^{11}+1058v^{10}+2367v^9+4336v^8+6398v^7+7081v^6+5404v^5+2621v^4+733v^3+100v^2+4v$
	8	$2v^{13} + 27v^{12} + 170v^{11} + 684v^{10} + 2009v^9 + 4482v^8 + 7390v^7 + 8520v^6 + 6470v^5 + 3027v^4 + 793v^3 + 98v^2 + 4v$
	9	$v^{13} + 18v^{12} + 143v^{11} + 696v^{10} + 2360v^9 + 5736v^8 + 9758v^7 + 11153v^6 + 8175v^5 + 3621v^4 + 882v^3 + 98v^2 + 3v$
	10	$v^{14} + 14v^{13} + 99v^{12} + 476v^{11} + 1723v^{10} + 4811v^9 + 10110v^8 + 15235v^7 + 15622v^6 + 10320v^5 + 4115v^4 + 898v^3 + 90v^2 + 3v$
	11	$v^{14} + 15v^{13} + 109v^{12} + 531v^{11} + 1968v^{10} + 5640v^9 + 11968v^8 + 17834v^7 + 17810v^6 + 11382v^5 + 4380v^4 + 919v^3 + 86v^2 + 2v$
	12	$6v^{13}+88v^{12}+622v^{11}+2747v^{10}+8198v^9+16835v^8+23543v^7+21810v^6+12816v^5+4475v^4+839v^3+72v^2+2v$
	13	$v^{17} + 17v^{16} + 136v^{15} + 680v^{14} + 2382v^{13} + 6226v^{12} + 12696v^{11} + 21033v^{10} + 29378v^9 + 35038v^8 + 34367v^7 + 25583v^6 + 13175v^5 + 4287v^4 + 786v^3 + 64v^2 + v$
	14	$v^{16} + 16v^{15} + 120v^{14} + 561v^{13} + 1840v^{12} + 4555v^{11} + 9054v^{10} + 15182v^9$ $+21573v^8 + 24525v^7 + 20430v^6 + 11437v^5 + 3934v^4 + 733v^3 + 59v^2 + v$
	15	$2v^{15} + 30v^{14} + 210v^{13} + 919v^{12} + 2859v^{11} + 6841v^{10} + 13176v^9 + 20433v^8$ $+24332v^7 + 20679v^6 + 11583v^5 + 3909v^4 + 702v^3 + 54v^2 + v$
	16	$5v^{14} + 70v^{13} + 456v^{12} + 1846v^{11} + 5245v^{10} + 11163v^9 + 18175v^8 + 22059v^7 + 18778v^6 + 10360v^5 + 3368v^4 + 559v^3 + 35v^2 + v$
	17	$7v^{13} + 91v^{12} + 555v^{11} + 2141v^{10} + 5865v^9 + 11694v^8 + 16430v^7 + 15354v^6 + 8911v^5 + 2937v^4 + 471v^3 + 26v^2$
	18	$11v^{12} + 144v^{11} + 909v^{10} + 3516v^9 + 8723v^8 + 13794v^7 + 13539v^6 + 7867v^5 + 2498v^4 + 374v^3 + 20v^2$
	19	$v^{13} + 19v^{12} + 172v^{11} + 952v^{10} + 3431v^9 + 8093v^8 + 12271v^7 + 11589v^6 + 6504v^5 + 2011v^4 + 296v^3 + 14v^2$
	20	$4v^{12} + 78v^{11} + 594v^{10} + 2450v^9 + 6094v^8 + 9416v^7 + 8925v^6 + 4945v^5 + 1444v^4 + 182v^3 + 10v^2$
	21	$v^{14} + 14v^{13} + 91v^{12} + 378v^{11} + 1166v^{10} + 2831v^9 + 5286v^8 + 7084v^7 + 6284v^6 + 3383v^5 + 995v^4 + 138v^3 + 6v^2$
	22	$v^{13} + 13v^{12} + 80v^{11} + 325v^{10} + 979v^9 + 2179v^8 + 3370v^7 + 3358v^6 + 1986v^5 + 634v^4 + 95v^3 + 4v^2$
	23	$v^{12} + 12v^{11} + 72v^{10} + 292v^9 + 830v^8 + 1563v^7 + 1824v^6 + 1229v^5 + 431v^4 + 63v^3 + 2v^2$
	24	$2v^{11} + 22v^{10} + 118v^9 + 394v^8 + 834v^7 + 1061v^6 + 750v^5 + 259v^4 + 33v^3 + v^2$
	25	$3v^{10} + 28v^9 + 124v^8 + 315v^7 + 458v^6 + 356v^5 + 134v^4 + 18v^3$
	26	$3v^9 + 24v^8 + 84v^7 + 151v^6 + 138v^5 + 58v^4 + 9v^3$
	27	$3v^8 + 18v^7 + 43v^6 + 48v^5 + 24v^4 + 4v^3$
	28	$v^7 + 4v^6 + 6v^5 + 4v^4 + v^3$
B_8	0	$v^8 + 8v^7 + 28v^6 + 56v^5 + 70v^4 + 56v^3 + 28v^2 + 8v + 1$
	1	$7v^8 + 50v^7 + 153v^6 + 260v^5 + 265v^4 + 162v^3 + 55v^2 + 8v$
	2	$v^{10} + 14v^9 + 92v^8 + 327v^7 + 682v^6 + 871v^5 + 684v^4 + 317v^3 + 77v^2 + 7v$
	3	$v^{11} + 16v^{10} + 112v^9 + 454v^8 + 1150v^7 + 1863v^6 + 1931v^5 + 1252v^4 + 479v^3 + 95v^2 + 7v$
	4	$v^{12} + 15v^{11} + 108v^{10} + 486v^9 + 1471v^8 + 3015v^7 + 4128v^6 + 3690v^5 + 2070v^4 + 676v^3 + 110v^2 + 6v$

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q), q^d)$
	5	$v^{13}+13v^{12}+92v^{11}+448v^{10}+1561v^9+3870v^8+6700v^7+7900v^6+6143v^5+3004v^4+853v^3+121v^2+6v$
	6	$2v^{13}+31v^{12}+229v^{11}+1065v^{10}+3401v^9+7627v^8+11942v^7+12788v^6+9067v^5+4047v^4+1042v^3+130v^2+5v$
	7	$v^{14}+18v^{13}+149v^{12}+771v^{11}+2814v^{10}+7535v^9+14748v^8+20617v^7+19928v^6+12771v^5+5109v^4+1158v^3+126v^2+5v$
	8	$v^{15}+16v^{14}+124v^{13}+621v^{12}+2266v^{11}+6414v^{10}+14299v^9+24504v^8+30923v^7+27414v^6+16226v^5+6012v^4+1263v^3+124v^2+3v$
	9	$3v^{14}+48v^{13}+378v^{12}+1922v^{11}+6888v^{10}+17710v^9+32338v^8+41105v^7+35391v^6+19841v^5+6811v^4+1293v^3+113v^2+3v$
	10	$v^{15}+20v^{14}+189v^{13}+1114v^{12}+4582v^{11}+13794v^{10}+30628v^9+49418v^8+56495v^7+44316v^6+22875v^5+7315v^4+1311v^3+106v^2+2v$
	11	$v^{17}+17v^{16}+137v^{15}+697v^{14}+2530v^{13}+7072v^{12}+16142v^{11}+31272v^{10}+51411v^9+68679v^8+69937v^7+50919v^6+24859v^5+7515v^4+1242v^3+90v^2+2v$
	12	$2v^{16}+33v^{15}+259v^{14}+1294v^{13}+4663v^{12}+13014v^{11}+29163v^{10}+52406v^9+73033v^8+75123v^7+54033v^6+25590v^5+7383v^4+1155v^3+80v^2+v$
	13	$6v^{15}+94v^{14}+700v^{13}+3304v^{12}+11101v^{11}+27994v^{10}+53590v^9+76467v^8+78518v^7+55502v^6+25562v^5+7094v^4+1035v^3+58v^2+v$
	14	$v^{16}+18v^{15}+161v^{14}+938v^{13}+3934v^{12}+12461v^{11}+30429v^{10}+57011v^9+79806v^8+80222v^7+55210v^6+24504v^5+6433v^4+865v^3+45v^2$
	15	$v^{17}+17v^{16}+138v^{15}+716v^{14}+2695v^{13}+7937v^{12}+19160v^{11}+38578v^{10}+63741v^9+82575v^8+79003v^7+52404v^6+22489v^5+5698v^4+731v^3+33v^2$
	16	$2v^{16}+32v^{15}+245v^{14}+1206v^{13}+4333v^{12}+12177v^{11}+27551v^{10}+49635v^9+68267v^8+67779v^7+45742v^6+19579v^5+4819v^4+576v^3+24v^2$
	17	$4v^{15}+60v^{14}+432v^{13}+2011v^{12}+6857v^{11}+18010v^{10}+36246v^9+53737v^8+55762v^7+38323v^6+16313v^5+3894v^4+439v^3+17v^2$
	18	$7v^{14}+101v^{13}+720v^{12}+3356v^{11}+11057v^{10}+25880v^9+42018v^8+45692v^7+31825v^6+13321v^5+3028v^4+316v^3+11v^2$
	19	$v^{16}+16v^{15}+123v^{14}+612v^{13}+2238v^{12}+6452v^{11}+15074v^{10}+28034v^9+39353v^8+38978v^7+25409v^6+10122v^5+2251v^4+239v^3+6v^2$
	20	$v^{15}+16v^{14}+125v^{13}+636v^{12}+2369v^{11}+6753v^{10}+14607v^9+22967v^8+24810v^7+17326v^6+7254v^5+1606v^4+145v^3+4v^2$
	21	$3v^{14}+44v^{13}+306v^{12}+1351v^{11}+4226v^{10}+9649v^9+15714v^8+17327v^7+12116v^6+4947v^5+1049v^4+98v^3+2v^2$
	22	$v^{14}+17v^{13}+132v^{12}+633v^{11}+2112v^{10}+5100v^9+8737v^8+10052v^7+7258v^6+3046v^5+665v^4+56v^3+v^2$
	23	$v^{13}+18v^{12}+142v^{11}+661v^{10}+2007v^9+4029v^8+5170v^7+4012v^6+1749v^5+377v^4+32v^3$
	24	$2v^{12}+29v^{11}+186v^{10}+696v^9+1629v^8+2354v^7+2001v^6+937v^5+214v^4+17v^3$
	25	$3v^{11}+36v^{10}+190v^9+556v^8+938v^7+882v^6+429v^5+95v^4+8v^3$
	26	$3v^{10}+31v^9+130v^8+276v^7+306v^6+169v^5+42v^4+3v^3$
	27	$3v^9+22v^8+62v^7+82v^6+50v^5+12v^4+v^3$
	28	$v^8+5v^7+9v^6+7v^5+2v^4$
C_8	0	$v^8+8v^7+28v^6+56v^5+70v^4+56v^3+28v^2+8v+1$
	1	$v^9+14v^8+71v^7+188v^6+295v^5+286v^4+169v^3+56v^2+8v$
	2	$v^{10}+17v^9+110v^8+371v^7+737v^6+906v^5+692v^4+315v^3+76v^2+7v$
	3	$v^{11}+17v^{10}+123v^9+501v^8+1254v^7+1996v^6+2034v^5+1301v^4+493v^3+97v^2+7v$
	4	$v^{12}+16v^{11}+120v^{10}+551v^9+1663v^8+3346v^7+4467v^6+3889v^5+2128v^4+680v^3+109v^2+6v$
	5	$v^{13}+15v^{12}+107v^{11}+500v^{10}+1687v^9+4116v^8+7057v^7+8244v^6+6350v^5+3080v^4+870v^3+123v^2+6v$
	6	$v^{13}+21v^{12}+188v^{11}+993v^{10}+3438v^9+8056v^8+12816v^7+13682v^6+9559v^5+4177v^4+1051v^3+129v^2+5v$
	7	$2v^{14}+30v^{13}+218v^{12}+1023v^{11}+3462v^{10}+8768v^9+16485v^8+22339v^7+21035v^6+13191v^5+5199v^4+1173v^3+128v^2+5v$
	8	$2v^{14}+36v^{13}+300v^{12}+1541v^{11}+5446v^{10}+13807v^9+25188v^8+32490v^7+28795v^6+16852v^5+6140v^4+1263v^3+121v^2+3v$
	9	$v^{16}+16v^{15}+121v^{14}+583v^{13}+2051v^{12}+5732v^{11}+13329v^{10}+25778v^9+39701v^8+45811v^7+37339v^6+20301v^5+6870v^4+1303v^3+115v^2+3v$
	10	$3v^{15}+48v^{14}+364v^{13}+1750v^{12}+6037v^{11}+15913v^{10}+32559v^9+50569v^8+57183v^7+44909v^6+23248v^5+7408v^4+1303v^3+102v^2+2v$
	11	$v^{16}+16v^{15}+127v^{14}+671v^{13}+2652v^{12}+8295v^{11}+20899v^{10}+41643v^9+62930v^8+68711v^7+51655v^6+25352v^5+7566v^4+1231v^3+91v^2+2v$
	12	$3v^{15}+52v^{14}+433v^{13}+2287v^{12}+8559v^{11}+23740v^{10}+48967v^9+73556v^8+77946v^7+56086v^6+26122v^5+7364v^4+1129v^3+75v^2+v$
	13	$v^{17}+17v^{16}+138v^{15}+715v^{14}+2683v^{13}+7882v^{12}+19096v^{11}+38978v^{10}+65736v^9+86995v^8+84977v^7+57777v^6+25751v^5+6961v^4+1000v^3+59v^2+v$
	14	$2v^{16}+33v^{15}+263v^{14}+1352v^{13}+5053v^{12}+14616v^{11}+33546v^{10}+60474v^9+82591v^8+81486v^7+55158v^6+24132v^5+6289v^4+856v^3+46v^2$
	15	$6v^{15}+94v^{14}+705v^{13}+3360v^{12}+11383v^{11}+28791v^{10}+54792v^9+76801v^8+76359v^7+51383v^6+22065v^5+5564v^4+717v^3+34v^2$

$G(q)$	d	$k(U(q),q^d)$
	16	$v^{17}+17v^{16}+136v^{15}+690v^{14}+2528v^{13}+7244v^{12}+17146v^{11}+34321v^{10}+56932v^9+73985v^8+70364v^7+45823v^6+19069v^5+4640v^4+569v^3+25v^2$
	17	$2v^{16}+32v^{15}+240v^{14}+1140v^{13}+3921v^{12}+10587v^{11}+23347v^{10}+41593v^9+56879v^8+55984v^7+37218v^6+15598v^5+3743v^4+434v^3+17v^2$
	18	$4v^{15}+60v^{14}+423v^{13}+1893v^{12}+6119v^{11}+15214v^{10}+29353v^9+42416v^8+43378v^7+29502v^6+12435v^5+2945v^4+330v^3+12v^2$
	19	$7v^{14}+99v^{13}+661v^{12}+2798v^{11}+8405v^{10}+18491v^9+29201v^8+31629v^7+22218v^6+9459v^5+2212v^4+234v^3+6v^2$
	20	$12v^{13}+164v^{12}+1041v^{11}+4053v^{10}+10556v^9+18595v^8+21609v^7+15855v^6+6884v^5+1583v^4+155v^3+4v^2$
	21	$v^{14}+14v^{13}+108v^{12}+584v^{11}+2270v^{10}+6219v^9+11616v^8+14180v^7+10743v^6+4706v^5+1064v^4+102v^3+2v^2$
	22	$2v^{13}+29v^{12}+208v^{11}+958v^{10}+2985v^9+6182v^8+8163v^7+6526v^6+2950v^5+677v^4+64v^3+v^2$
	23	$3v^{12}+44v^{11}+289v^{10}+1124v^9+2737v^8+4085v^7+3573v^6+1725v^5+411v^4+37v^3$
	24	$4v^{11}+56v^{10}+321v^9+1004v^8+1798v^7+1798v^6+953v^5+236v^4+20v^3$
	25	$5v^{10}+62v^9+291v^8+674v^7+803v^6+474v^5+124v^4+10v^3$
	26	$6v^9+59v^8+199v^7+299v^6+205v^5+58v^4+3v^3$
	27	$7v^8+44v^7+92v^6+77v^5+23v^4+v^3$
	28	$v^8+8v^7+21v^6+20v^5+5v^4$
D_8	0	$v^8+8v^7+28v^6+56v^5+70v^4+56v^3+28v^2+8v+1$
	1	$v^9+13v^8+64v^7+167v^6+260v^5+251v^4+148v^3+49v^2+7v$
	2	$v^{10}+15v^9+92v^8+304v^7+602v^6+746v^5+580v^4+272v^3+69v^2+7v$
	3	$v^{11}+14v^{10}+94v^9+377v^8+953v^7+1548v^6+1618v^5+1065v^4+416v^3+84v^2+6v$
	4	$2v^{11}+35v^{10}+246v^9+939v^8+2166v^7+3151v^6+2914v^5+1675v^4+562v^3+96v^2+6v$
	5	$v^{12}+19v^{11}+160v^{10}+778v^9+2358v^8+4593v^7+5807v^6+4728v^5+2403v^4+711v^3+105v^2+5v$
	6	$v^{14}+14v^{13}+93v^{12}+392v^{11}+1209v^{10}+2977v^9+5894v^8+8858v^7+9445v^6+6754v^5+3055v^4+801v^3+104v^2+5v$
	7	$3v^{13}+42v^{12}+280v^{11}+1202v^{10}+3677v^9+8080v^8+12412v^7+12906v^6+8770v^5+3704v^4+890v^3+101v^2+3v$
	8	$5v^{13}+75v^{12}+514v^{11}+2180v^{10}+6342v^9+12943v^8+18300v^7+17473v^6+10876v^5+4182v^4+906v^3+93v^2+3v$
	9	$v^{15}+15v^{14}+108v^{13}+510v^{12}+1802v^{11}+5044v^{10}+11247v^9+19327v^8+24342v^7+21367v^6+12437v^5+4513v^4+923v^3+86v^2+2v$
	10	$3v^{14}+45v^{13}+323v^{12}+1491v^{11}+4921v^{10}+11986v^9+21336v^8+26937v^7+23222v^6+13058v^5+4489v^4+848v^3+73v^2+2v$
	11	$11v^{13}+161v^{12}+1084v^{11}+4437v^{10}+12119v^9+22675v^8+28916v^7+24578v^6+13414v^5+4426v^4+795v^3+63v^2+v$
	12	$v^{16}+16v^{15}+120v^{14}+562v^{13}+1870v^{12}+4840v^{11}+10437v^{10}+19145v^9+28576v^8+32109v^7+25209v^6+12925v^5+3999v^4+659v^3+45v^2+v$
	13	$2v^{15}+30v^{14}+211v^{13}+938v^{12}+3026v^{11}+7682v^{10}+15712v^9+24986v^8+28984v^7+23016v^6+11759v^5+3570v^4+561v^3+32v^2$
	14	$4v^{14}+56v^{13}+369v^{12}+1556v^{11}+4798v^{10}+11272v^9+19640v^8+24046v^7+19573v^6+9983v^5+2933v^4+430v^3+24v^2$
	15	$8v^{13}+105v^{12}+665v^{11}+2718v^{10}+7716v^9+15082v^8+19625v^7+16335v^6+8264v^5+2344v^4+323v^3+16v^2$
	16	$v^{14}+17v^{13}+142v^{12}+750v^{11}+2752v^{10}+7221v^9+13315v^8+16567v^7+13236v^6+6406v^5+1730v^4+226v^3+11v^2$
	17	$2v^{13}+32v^{12}+246v^{11}+1170v^{10}+3694v^9+7747v^8+10529v^7+8957v^6+4548v^5+1276v^4+169v^3+6v^2$
	18	$v^{14}+14v^{13}+94v^{12}+412v^{11}+1333v^{10}+3302v^9+6063v^8+7701v^7+6289v^6+3065v^5+804v^4+95v^3+4v^2$
	19	$v^{13}+13v^{12}+85v^{11}+373v^{10}+1177v^9+2605v^8+3808v^7+3457v^6+1828v^5+508v^4+61v^3+2v^2$
	20	$2v^{12}+24v^{11}+139v^{10}+506v^9+1224v^8+1910v^7+1812v^6+976v^5+271v^4+32v^3+v^2$
	21	$3v^{11}+31v^{10}+153v^9+449v^8+807v^7+858v^6+509v^5+151v^4+16v^3$
	22	$3v^{10}+27v^9+109v^8+239v^7+292v^6+191v^5+61v^4+8v^3$
	23	$3v^9+21v^8+61v^7+90v^6+69v^5+25v^4+3v^3$
	24	$v^8+5v^7+10v^6+10v^5+5v^4+v^3$

TABLE 3. $k(U(q),q^d)$ as polynomial in $v=q-1$

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Eamonn A. O'Brien and William Unger for verifying the values of the polynomials from Table 1 for some small good primes. Part of the research for this paper was done during a stay of the second author at the University of Birmingham supported by a stipend of the Ruth and Gert Massenberg Foundation, and also during a visit of the first author to Ruhr-University Bochum. We thank the referees for numerous comments, which have improved the exposition of this paper.

References

[1] P. Bardsley and R. W. Richardson, *Étale slices for algebraic transformation groups in characteristic p*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **51** (1985), no. 2, 295–317.

[2] A. Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **126**, Springer-Verlag 1991.

[3] M. Boyarchenko and M. Sabitova, *The orbit method for profinite groups and a p-adic analogue of Brown's Theorem*, Israel J. Math. **165** (2008), 67–91.

[4] J. D. Bradley and S. M. Goodwin, *Conjugacy classes in Sylow p-subgroups of finite Chevalley groups in bad characteristic*, Comm. Algebra **42** (2014), no. 8, 3245–3258.

[5] H. Bürgstein and W. H. Hesselink, *Algorithmic orbit classification for some Borel group actions*, Comp. Math. **61** (1987), 3–41.

[6] F. Digne and J. Michel, *Representations of finite groups of Lie type*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts **21**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[7] A. Evseev, *Reduction for characters of finite algebra groups*, J. Algebra **325** (2011), 321–351.

[8] The GAP Group, *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.3*. 2002, http://www.gap-system.org.

[9] S. M. Goodwin, *Relative Springer isomorphisms*, J. Algebra **290** (2005), no. 1, 266–281.

[10] ———, *On the conjugacy classes in maximal unipotent subgroups of simple algebraic groups*, Transform. Groups **11** (2006), no. 1, 51–76.

[11] S. M. Goodwin, P. Mosch and G. Röhrle, *Calculating conjugacy classes in Sylow p-subgroups of finite Chevalley groups of rank six and seven*, LMS J. Comput. Math. **17** (2014), no. 1, 109–122.

[12] S. M. Goodwin and G. Röhrle, *Calculating conjugacy classes in Sylow p-subgroups of finite Chevalley groups*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), no. 11, 3321–3334.

[13] G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister and H. Schönemann, *Singular 3-1-1*, A Computer Algebra System for Polynomial Computations, Centre for Computer Algebra, University of Kaiserslautern, 2009. http://www.singular.uni-kl.de

[14] Z. Halasi and P. P. Pálfy, *The number of conjugacy classes in pattern groups is not a polynomial function*, J. Group Theory, **14** (2011), 841–854.

[15] G. Higman, *Enumerating p-groups. I. Inequalities*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **10** (1960) 24–30.

[16] F. Himstedt and S. Huang, *Character table of a Borel subgroup of the Ree groups* ${}^2F_4(q^2)$, LMS J. Comput. Math. **12** (2009), 1–53.

[17] F. Himstedt, T. Le and K. Magaard *Characters of the Sylow p-Subgroups of the Chevalley Groups* $D_4(p^n)$, J. Algebra **332** (2011), 414–427.

[18] I. M. Isaacs, *Characters of groups associated with finite algebras*, J. Algebra **177** (1995), 708–730.

[19] ———, *Counting characters of upper triangular groups*, J. Algebra **315** (2007), no. 2, 698–719.

[20] U. Jürgens and G. Röhrle, *Algorithmic modality analysis for parabolic groups*, Geom. Dedicata **73** (1998), no. 3, 317–337.

[21] D. Kazhdan, *Proof of Springer's Hypothesis*, Israel J. Math. **28** (1977), no. 4, 272–286.

[22] A. A. Kirillov, *Unitary representations of nilpotent Lie groups*, Russ. Math. Surv. **17** (1962), no. 4, 53–104.

[23] ———, *Variations on the triangular theme*, In *Lie groups and Lie algebras: E. B. Dynkin's Seminar*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2, **169** (1995), 43–73.

[24] T. Le, *Irreducible characters of Sylow p-subgroups of the Steinberg triality groups* ${}^3D_4(p^{3m})$, preprint, arxiv:1309.1583.

[25] T. Le and K. Magaard, *On the Character Degrees of Sylow p-subgroups of Chevalley Group of Type* $E(p^f)$, Forum Mathematicum, to appear.

[26] G. I. Lehrer, *Discrete series and the unipotent subgroup*, Compos. Math. **28** (1974), 9–19.

[27] E. Marberg, *Combinatorial methods for character enumeration for the unitriangular groups*, J. Algebra **345** (2011), 295–323.

[28] ———, *Exotic characters of unitriangular matrix groups*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **216** (2012), 239–254.

[29] P. Mosch, *On adjoint and coadjoint orbits of maximal unipotent subgroups of reductive algebraic groups*, PhD Thesis, Ruhr-University Bochum, 2014.

[30] R. W. Richardson, *Conjugacy classes in Lie algebras and algebraic groups*, Ann. Math. **86**, (1967), 1–15.

[31] G. R. Robinson, *Counting conjugacy classes of unitriangular groups associated to finite-dimensional algebras*, J. Group Theory **1** (1998), no. 3, 271–274.
[32] G. Röhrle, *A note on the modality of parabolic subgroups*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **8** (1997), no. 4, 549–559.
[33] ———, *On the modality of parabolic subgroups of linear algebraic groups*, Manuscripta Math. **98**(1), (1999), 9–20.
[34] J. Sangroniz, *Character degrees of the Sylow p-subgroups of classical groups*, Groups St. Andrews 2001 in Oxford. Vol. II, 487–493, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 305, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003.
[35] ———, *Characters of algebra groups and unitriangular groups*, Finite groups 2003, 335–349, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2004.
[36] J.-P. Serre, *The notion of complete reducibility in group theory*, Moursund Lectures, Part II, University of Oregon, 1998, `arXiv:0305257v1`.
[37] M. C. Slattery, *Computing character degrees in p-groups*, J. Symbolic Comput. 2 (1986), no. 1, 51–58.
[38] T. A. Springer, *The unipotent variety of a semi-simple group*. 1969 Algebraic Geometry (Internat. Colloq., Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Bombay, 1968) pp. 373391; Oxford Univ. Press, London.
[39] T. A. Springer and R. Steinberg, *Conjugacy classes*, In *Seminar on algebraic groups and related finite groups*, Springer-Verlag, 1970.
[40] J. Thompson, $k(\mathrm{U}_n(F_q))$, Manuscript.
[41] A. Vera-López and J. M. Arregi, *Conjugacy classes in unitriangular matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl. **370** (2003), 85–124.
[42] È. B. Vinberg, *Complexity of actions of reductive groups*, (Russian) Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **20** (1986), no. 1, 1–13, 96.
[43] È. B. Vinberg and V. L. Popov, *Invariant theory*, Encyclopaedia of Math. Sci. Algebraic geometry, IV vol. 55 Springer Verlag 1994 (Translated from Russian Series: Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., Moscow, 1989, pp. 137–314).

School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom
E-mail address: `s.m.goodwin@bham.ac.uk`

Fakultät für Mathematik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, D-44780 Bochum, Germany
E-mail address: `peter.mosch@rub.de`
E-mail address: `gerhard.roehrle@rub.de`